DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 925 PS 029 155

AUTHOR	Thomas, Nancy G., Ed.
TITLE	Social Policy Report, 1999.
INSTITUTION	Society for Research in Child Development.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	98p.; Published quarterly. Volume XIII, Number 4 was edited by Lonnie Sherrod.
AVAILABLE FROM	SRCD Executive Office, University of Michigan, 505 East Huron, Suite 301, Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522; Tel: 734-998-6578 (non-members, $4.80 each, $15 yearly).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Social Policy Report; v13 n1-4 1999
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Children; Elementary Secondary Education; *Fathers; *Information Dissemination; Parent Child Relationship; Partnerships in Education; Periodicals; Prevention; *Program Evaluation; *Public Policy; Research; School Community Relationship; *Service Learning; Violence; Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This document is comprised of the four 1999 issues of a publication providing a forum for scholarly reviews and discussion of developmental research and its implications for the social policies affecting children. The topics of the issues are: (1) "Beyond 'Giving Science Away': How University-Community Partnerships Inform Youth Programs, Research, and Policy" (Jill Denner, Catherine R. Cooper, Edward M. Lopez, and Nora Dunbar); (2) "Perspectives on Father Involvement: Research and Policy" (Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda and Natasha Cabrera); (3) "Evaluating the Effectiveness of School-Based Violence Prevention: Developmental Approaches" (Christopher C. Henrich, Joshua L. Brown, and J. Lawrence Aber); and (4) "Service Learning: Who Benefits and Why" (Arthur A. Stukas, Jr., E. Gil Clary, and Mark Snyder). Each issue contains references. (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 448 925

Social Policy Report, 1999

Nancy G. Thomas, Editor

Volume XIII, Numbers 1-4

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N.G. Thomas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PS 029 155

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOCIAL POLICY REPORT
Society for Research in Child Development

Volume XIII, Number 1 1999

Beyond "Giving Science Away": How University-Community Partnerships Inform Youth Programs, Research, and Policy

Jill Denner, Catherine R. Cooper, Edward M. Lopez, and Nora Dunbar

There is a clear need to bridge the gaps between research, practice, and policy for youth (Takanishi, 1993). In this report we propose that university-community partnerships afford the exchange of existing knowledge and the generation of new knowledge that serves this goal. We use examples from our recent research with two youth programs to illustrate steps to creating and maintaining university-community partnerships with an intergenerational and ethnically diverse team that includes youth, families, and staff as well as undergraduates, graduate students, post-doctoral researchers, and faculty. We show how such research can generate knowledge that is relevant for programs and their participants as well as for theoretical debates and social and educational policy.

Contents

Connecting research, policy, and community practice 2

Three models of university and community research 2

Steps to building university partnerships with community programs 4

1. Make goals explicit.
2. Choose a program and develop relationships.
3. Choose your primary contacts.
4. Develop a common language.
5. Learn about the program's history with research.
6. Define roles in the partnership.
7. Do research with theoretical and social relevance.
8. Have an early success.
9. Collect data together.
10. Make findings accessible.
11. Produce products for multiple stakeholders.

How partnerships make research relevant for multiple stakeholders 8

Challenges to successful partnerships and good research 11

Resources for successful partnerships . . . 12

ED 029155

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

©1999 Society for Research in Child Development. All rights reserved.

Connecting Research, Policy, and Community Practice

In recent years, researchers in developmental psychology have renewed their interest in connecting basic research and theory development to applied and policy-relevant research. This marks a return to the goals and values of the Child Study movement of the 19th century, when development was studied in its natural contexts (White, 1996) and interventions were aimed at enhancing those contexts. It also harks back to the Civil Rights era of the 1960s when many developmental scholars were active in federal, state, and local work on behalf of children, youth, and families. Some current work focuses on youth programs and how best to invest in youth by building on the existing strategies of youth, families, and those who work with them (National Research Council, 1993; Takanishi, 1996), while other work focuses more on schooling and youth. And a new generation of research examines how youth move across their worlds of family, school, peers, and community and how intergenerational linkages can bridge between individual relationships and institutions (Cooper & Denner, 1998).

In her address to the 1997 SRCD biennial meeting, Hillary Rodham Clinton urged the research community to "make the connection between research, public policy, and people's ordinary lives" ("Mrs. Clinton: Connect Research," 1997, p. 1). While many psychologists conduct research designed to affect specific social policies (Carnegie Council, 1992; Lorion, Iscoe, DeLeon, & VandenBos, 1996; Takanishi, 1993; Zeldin & Price, 1995) or to strengthen specific programs (Barber & Crockett, 1993; Lerner & Galambos, 1998; National Research Council, 1993), other researchers struggle with how to conduct research that contributes more effectively to the general well-being of children, youth, and families. For research and policy to be relevant to diverse groups of people, those groups must be represented at the table (Allen & Grobman, 1996).

The goal of applied social science research is to "solve a problem or to provide information that can be put to some specific use" (Zigler, 1998, pp. 532-533). Such research strives to be both ecologically valid, i.e., reflecting the conditions, including the values of local communities, and externally valid, i.e., being relevant to communities beyond those involved in the original studies (Bandura, 1997; Fisher & Murray, 1996; Smith, 1990). Yet achieving both forms of validity can be difficult (McAdoo, 1990; McLoyd & Steinberg, 1998). For example, findings involving programs in one cultural community cannot be generalized directly to other culturally distinct populations (Laosa, 1990). Determining what about a program made a difference may be blocked by difficulties in achieving random sampling and assignment to conditions. These tensions between community-specific and universal goals, which are not easily resolved, confront researchers who seek to make their work meaningful for theory, policy, and practice (Cooper & Denner, 1998).

Three Models of University and Community Research

Researchers as Expert Consultants

In the first model, university representatives serve as consultants who conduct research. They act as experts who "give away" knowledge based on research on national or state samples. A disadvantage of this model is that community members may distrust or disbelieve data that were not collected in their community (Small, 1996). In other words, the information provided may not be ecologically valid for the local community. Although such consultations may be useful, this model does not incorporate perspectives of community members, nor does it increase their capacity to

work on their own questions.

Community Agendas

In the second model, community members identify a specific problem and university researchers and community members work together to solve it. In this case, research is driven by local questions rather than by theoretical or empirical scholarship. This model tends to emphasize the ready expertise of community members over that of researchers (Peterson, 1995), so that data may be ecologically but not externally valid, decreasing their relevance for universal theory development. Because this model is problem-driven, the likelihood that the research will be sustained may be limited.

University-Community Partnerships

In the third model, research questions are asked in the context of specific communities and programs but also examine universal processes to address theoretical debates and policy issues that reach beyond individual communities (Cooper & Denner, 1998). By building on the goals of community members and engaging them as partners, researchers—who bring theoretical and methodological tools—help communities identify and use their own resources (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993; Weiss & Greene, 1992). In this "collaboration among stakeholders" model (Cooper, Jackson, Azmitia, Lopez, & Dunbar, 1995; Tharp & Yamauchi, 1994), collaborative relationships are developed from the beginning among program staff, families, school personnel, policymakers, and youth themselves. In this way, stakeholders work together to define the goals of the research and how programs are developed, monitored over time, and evaluated. These partnerships increase the likelihood that research will include the perspectives of underrepresented groups. Thus the goals of the partnership model are to work together to construct research priorities, improve method and refine theory, develop a sustainable research infrastructure in the community, and provide information that helps improve programs and policies over time.

The university-community partnership model grows out of traditions of action research, in which research is driven both by questions of community members and theoretical debates of different academic disciplines (Rapaport, 1985; Small, 1995). Current university-community partnerships respond to various pressures—to national policy interest in community building, to a growing emphasis on program and school accountability to funders at local, state, and national levels, to interest in community-level data, to the need for research on and by underrepresented groups, and to concerns over racial, ethnic, and social class divisions in our communities. Finally, concern about inequitable access of diverse groups to educational opportunities, from kindergarten to college, has begun to bring together schools and religious, business, medical, and juvenile justice communities to act on behalf of youth and families.

In the service of these goals, this paper focuses on three themes:

(1) steps to building sustainable university-community partnerships;
(2) relevance of such collaborations for programs, participants, researchers, and policymakers; and
(3) challenges and resources for sustainable university-community partnerships.

To illustrate this approach, we draw from two sources: our collaborative research with youth program professionals and front-line staff; and analyses of previous university-community partnerships which have addressed social problems and the training of socially responsible researchers (Fisher, Murray, & Sigel, 1996; Fitzgerald, Abrams, Church, Votruba, & Imig, 1996; McHale & Lerner,

1996; Oden, 1995; Ostrom, Lerner, & Freel, 1995; Small, 1996; Zeldin, 1995).

Steps to Building University Partnerships with Community Programs

The steps described here build on our experiences as a university-based research team in partnership with two community youth programs. Our university research group has collaborated for three years with two community-based nonprofit organizations whose executives and staff members wanted to learn more about how their programs made a difference for youth.

Our work on university-community partnerships draws on anthropology, psychology, sociology, and social policy to link individuals, relationships, institutions, and cultural communities over time. Our first perspective is an intergenerational model that values the perspectives of children, youth, and young adults, as well as adults and elders; we build cultural bridges that create opportunities for youth to "move up" as leaders and for younger and older adults to "give back" to children, youth, and communities (Cooper, 1997; Cooper & Denner, 1996). Our second perspective is a youth development approach that emphasizes the strengths rather than only the problems of youth and aims to build on youth's initiative (Denner, Lopez, Cooper, & Dunbar, 1998; Zeldin, 1995). Third, our work draws on the Bridging Multiple Worlds model, which addresses how ethnically diverse youth navigate their worlds of families, schools, peers, and communities as they move through school (Cooper, in press; Cooper et al., 1995; Phelan, Davidson, & Yu, 1991).

In our community partnership, the university research group has included a faculty member, a postdoctoral fellow, two graduate students, and four undergraduate students (two of whom were also program staff). We formed partnerships with two programs that work with low-income and minority youth and their families; most participants and staff are of Mexican descent.

The first program is privately funded and is modeled on Lang's "I Have a Dream" program. It provides academic outreach to a selected group of sixth to twelfth graders by offering after-school tutoring, weekend and summer classes, and academic advising for parents and students. Upon completion of high school and enrollment in the local community college, the students receive a $1,000 scholarship.

The second program is part of a nonprofit national organization that provides alternatives to youth violence through community outreach, leadership development, and economic development. Their youth programs include academic help, personal support, cultural experiences, and job opportunities. Our work with this latter organization was concentrated in three community-based after-school programs, which provide a safe place for children and adolescents to learn, socialize, and have fun.

Our partners requested that we use our partnership experience to prepare guidelines for the next generation of researchers who work with their programs. This report formulates these guidelines. The recommended steps to building sound partnerships are as follows:

Step 1. Make goals explicit.
University and community partners must clarify what they want to accomplish and be prepared for goals to change as staff and other resources and priorities shift.

The reasons for engaging in a partnership must be made clear. It has been suggested that "for universities, the mission is to provide training experiences that will equip the next generation of professionals to address the developmental needs of society. For community organizations, the mission is to provide the services that are needed for today, not tomorrow, or in the next generation" (Fisher & Murray, 1996, p. 9).

For example, program staff may be looking for volunteers and concentrating on how to attract youth and hold their attention, while program executives may need data on participation, impact, and cost effectiveness. On the university's part, student participants may be looking for experience with programs and research, whereas faculty may want publishable data that speak to their research questions and will satisfy funders. We found, however, that universities and community programs also have overlapping goals, which include building their community. It is the task of the partnership to define these goals and develop ways to build common ground and negotiate differences (Mayo, 1997).

Our university team came to the partnership with questions raised by our previous theoretical and empirical work as well as our conversations and work with community program staff, youth, and families. In earlier work, we had developed the Bridging Multiple Worlds model (Cooper & Denner, 1998; Phelan et al., 1991) and had studied adolescents' strategies for negotiating challenges (Denner, Aber, & Allen, 1998). We were funded to address four core questions about how the multiple worlds of children's lives affect their developmental pathways (Thorne & Cooper, 1995). What are the contexts or worlds of children's daily lives? How do parents, teachers, and other key adults understand these worlds? How do children navigate their worlds to construct their own and others' development? How do social class, gender, race, ethnicity, and immigration status affect children's pathways? As our collaboration progressed, these questions were sharpened to speak more directly to the strengths and questions of the program staff.

Step 2. Choose a program and develop relationships.

Listen to program staff.

Partnerships are likely to develop more easily when they build on existing relationships with community members. Informal discussions can help identify shared interests, and conducting interviews with individuals in different roles helps to clarify the program's history, goals, and practices. Through such interviews, program staff come to know the research team and can convey their personal theories about what children and youth need to develop optimally (Denner, Orellana, & Cooper, 1997). These theories provide important information about how programs are run. For example, one staff member stressed the importance of "giving youth a context" and asked our help in organizing and participating in field trips. Beliefs about what youth need are grounded in the daily realities of the community and provide an important context for the research.

In communities with racial and social class divisions, universities are often seen as removed from the community. The greater these divisions, the more time is required for building relationships. Research groups working in ethnically diverse communities should include bilingual and bicultural researchers and people familiar with the local cultural context (Castaneda, Ulanoff, & Rios, 1996). In our partnership, two undergraduates worked as both program and university staff. Regardless of background, developing relationships among researchers and community members requires patience and time (Small, 1996).

Step 3. Choose your primary contacts.

Some partners are more closely connected to a program than others.

Partnerships can be formed "from the bottom up" by working with front-line staff or "from the top down" by working with management or executives. In some programs, executives and managers have the most interest or greatest concerns about research questions; in other programs, front-line staff welcome volunteers and have questions about how to strengthen their program; and, of course, both may be present in the same program.

Front-line staff are largely ignored in the literature because collaborations often involve the more senior staff. But younger staff provide a key bridge to the youth, families, and resources outside the program because they often come from the communities in which they work (Cooper, Denner, & Lopez, in press). And entering an organization from either the top or bottom can inhibit the necessary investment and cooperation from other levels. In our partnership we have found that long-term volunteering builds trust with all members of an organization.

Step 4. Develop a common language.
Informal interactions help establish common ground.

Volunteering to tutor or chaperone program events and attending local cultural events show commitment to a program. In our case, these activities helped the university researchers stay informed about the programs and about political issues in the Latino community. Because program staff and the youths' siblings, parents, and extended family members attended these events, we could have conversations in informal settings with them. This promoted a common language and understanding that were useful when it came time to develop shared project goals.

Step 5. Learn about the program's history with research.
Some communities have had negative experiences with researchers in the past.

Most university partners recognize that they are not the first researchers program staff have encountered. Many programs have experienced what our partners call "drive-by research," when researchers or evaluators have left the scene without making findings available or useful to program staff. Many individuals in organizations do not understand how research could help them and many are concerned that research findings could hurt them. It has also been argued that partnerships can be disempowering when one partner feels misrepresented (Mayo, 1997). Thus, it is important to discuss early on how research can benefit the program, as well as who makes decisions about the use of the data and how findings will be represented (Archer, Pettigrew, & Aronson, 1992). The partnership should not begin data collection until these issues are addressed.

Step. 6. Define roles in the partnership.
Identifying the decision-makers is crucial.

Successful partnerships decide at the outset who the partners are to be (Zeldin, 1995). Not all members of a community can be included in every decision. Youth and staff advisory groups contribute to the success of a partnership, and it is important that the decision-makers and advisors listen to the views of those they represent. Often there is one community individual whose motivation and creativity are key to the success of a program and prospective partnership (Heath & McLaughlin, 1991; McLaughlin, Irby, & Langman, 1994; Weiss, 1998). It is important to make sure this person is part of the partnership. Similarly, on the university side, only certain students and faculty are involved (Zeldin, 1995). While it is not necessary to limit who joins the partnership, it is important to secure the commitment of key liaisons for the long term.

Step 7. Do research with theoretical and social relevance.
Research questions must be relevant both to the program and to theoretical and policy debates.

Through ongoing discussions, we were able to identify the research questions of different members of the youth program offering alternatives to youth violence. They were interested in how to attract youth, what ac-

tivities were working, what youth thought of the program, and what they were getting out of it. As questions were developed, university participants summarized research on other programs that have succeeded in attracting and sustaining the involvement of youth (e.g., Heath & McLaughlin, 1991; Quinn, 1997). In addition, we linked questions of program staff to our guiding questions derived from research on the contexts of children's daily lives, how they seek out resources, and who helps them achieve their goals. As a result, we had a set of theoretically and socially relevant research questions: Who are the youth who come? Why do they participate? How does the program make a difference?

Step 8. Have an early success.
Begin with a simple task that is useful and can be readily accomplished.

Community program staff may expect answers more quickly than researchers typically generate them, and an early success helps build the partnership (Fitzgerald & Abrams, 1997). In the case of our programs, we and the staff wanted to know why youth attended the program, so a first step was to identify the patterns of program participation. By observing and inquiring, we learned that both programs were already collecting data on attendance. We used these data to make graphs to show variation in attendance over time. These were easy to understand and elicited questions from program staff about why youth attended and how they viewed the program. They recognized the value of these graphs and asked us to teach them how to make to them.

Step 9. Collect data together.
Find ways for team members to be involved in data collection.

It is important to involve both partners in aspects of each step of data collection—from instrument design, to data entry and analysis, to interpretation. Multiple methods, including field notes, focus groups, and surveys, as well as school grades, are useful to describe changes over time and to keep all people informed of what is being learned.

In our partnership, staff from each program helped make the research instruments relevant to their youth and assured that questions were appropriate. They also participated in translating the instruments into Spanish. Staff also played key roles in communicating with families and youth. They explained consent forms to parents and obtained data from children who were not present on data collection days. Staff also helped integrate data collection into daily activities as well as social events, such as family picnics, which were opportune times to obtain consent or hold parent meetings.

How a program is run can dictate what kind of data can be gathered. Some programs may have procedures already in place for collecting information. One program in our project, for example, already had years of data they could use to address their question about why youth participated. Analyses of these data revealed that youth were coming to see friends and to learn. To help address the research question, "How does the program make a difference?" attendance data were collected, but the program infrastructure made it difficult to collect these data systematically. Instead, program influence was addressed using data on youth perspectives, which indicate that academics, respect and rules, and recreation were the three main things learned. In addition, to illustrate potential developmental benefits, we summarized how program practices can be linked to what research literature suggests are the key developmental opportunities programs can provide.

Step 10. Make findings accessible.
All parties must have access to summaries of research findings, while individual-level data are kept confidential.

Most program staff, participants, and their families are not used to reading long reports or statistical analyses. And unfortunately, researchers do not always translate findings into useful information for programs and policy (Lorion et al., 1996; Zervigon-Hakes, 1995). Thus it is important in the partnership model that findings be made comprehensible for the lay person. Bilingual newsletters are useful for sharing research findings mixed with information about resources of use to children and families who can read; for others, oral presentations are more effective.

In our project many of our findings were presented in small data packets with graphs and talking points that summarized key findings on specific themes, such as why youth come to the program, youth understanding of contexts, and youth problem-solving strategies. We made presentations to funders and program staff on these topics and clarified questions. We also wrote articles and made presentations to academic audiences on the intergenerational model and on the strategies youth use to access resources. Because the research questions were generated together, both parties had little difficulty understanding their relevance and importance.

Step 11. Produce products for multiple stakeholders.
Tangible products include data, findings, and the infrastructure to support ongoing research.

Presenting findings in different formats serves to publicize results and strengthen university-community partnerships and community capacity. Our partnership generated information on youth goals, participation, and strategies for accessing resources; the importance of young adult brokers; and how youth experience the program. This information was presented in data packets, articles, and talks. The findings may bring programs together; students from one of our programs, for example, cited "becoming staff [of the other program]" as a career goal.

For maximum effectiveness, partnerships should build an infrastructure in the program that can support ongoing research. Our partnership developed forms and instruments for record-keeping, surveys, and databases that are still being used. The partnership also led to enhanced staff skills. In the course of tracking youth participation, for example, program staff requested and received training in maintaining computer records and making graphs. These are skills they can use in future projects.

How Partnerships Make Research Relevant for Multiple Stakeholders

Partnerships between university and community program personnel can generate useful knowledge for multiple stakeholders: program participants, program developers and staff, researchers, policymakers, families, schools, and youth. In general, our partnership built community networks and generated information about how and why youth engage in programs and what they learn from them, as well as how they navigate their worlds of families, peers, schools, and communities as they move through school. It is instructive to consider how our partnership process and findings spoke to and affected our different stakeholders.

Benefits to Youth in Programs

Program participants benefited by having opportunities to share their perspectives on the program and by seeing resulting changes. Through personal interactions and the surveys, youths' voices were made clearer to those in charge of the programs. For example, their viewpoint provided the impetus for writing

and receiving a grant to fund leadership activities for girls (Denner & Dunbar, 1997), as well as a restructuring of aspects of the programs. Staff of one program were surprised to find that 43% of their participants reported they learned about academics and 50% reported that program staff were the people most responsible for helping them with homework. As a result, the program's daily activities were restructured to allow an hour of quiet homework time. The partnership also gave youth participants greater access to adults with links to the university. Many of them had never been to a university. Through conversations and field trips with research staff, they learned about college life and opportunities and met college students with backgrounds similar to their own.

Benefits to Programs

Both programs in our partnership benefited from the extensive data obtained, including data on participation and impact required by their funders. The partnership also afforded access to and replicated other research on successful programs. Youth in one program reported that they participated to secure relationships with staff and peers, to learn, to have fun, and to have a safe place to be away from home and the neighborhood. In the other program, youth reported relying on school or themselves to achieve goals; but they did not always recognize how relationships and the community could help them achieve these goals. These findings are consistent with studies of other programs (Gambone & Arbreton, 1997; Higgins, 1988). Instruments that we used to collect data are still being used; these include a career timeline and questions about resources for achieving goals.

Our research staff helped programs to articulate the importance of these findings by situating them within the context of social and funding priorities, as well as within broader questions about risk and protective factors for children and adolescents. For example, youth responses that staff played an important role in why they participate fits with research and policy priorities about providing close, positive connections for youth.

A sustainable research infrastructure emerged as we collaborated on activity materials and data collection, increasing the capacity of program staff to track attendance and academic progress. Staff learned new skills, including how to ask research questions and how to enter and graph data on the computer. Following a trainin,, we offered on computer spreadsheets and data entry, one staff member transferred these new skills to his fundraising efforts. Others learned skills to better describe the value of what they do, such as showing their program to be a safe haven for children and youth. Because the research instruments we developed together tapped issues of interest to programs, including goals, strategies, and obstacles, and because they were interesting to youth, the programs continue to use these materials.

Benefits to Researchers and Scholarship

Researchers are especially interested in the theoretical relevance of data and the application of findings beyond the immediate community in which data are collected. Partnerships of the sort we pursued enhance the ecological and external validity of studies of programs and lead to theoretical advances based on the ideas, questions, and cultures of program staff and participants (Cooper et al., in press).

When researchers develop relationships with program staff and youth and their families, their research is more likely to reflect views of members of the community, including hard-to-reach youth (Small, 1996). Because we volunteered extensively and became part of the program "family," we had regular opportunities to listen to youth perspectives, which in turn helped us find common interests and rel-

evant questions. Partnerships with community members also helped us bridge the cultural, racial, ethnic, and social class divisions that too often stand in the way of incorporating participants' perspectives in research.

Research on community-level risks and opportunities benefits from data we collected on individuals' perceptions of programs and communities. For example, our findings build on studies that emphasize the importance of social support and services for low-income youth (Price, Cioci, Penner, & Trautlein, 1993). Working closely with program staff and participants alerted us to how youth actively negotiate and create resources (Denner, Lopez, Cooper, & Dunbar, 1998) and helped us better understand the key contexts of child development.

Working with program staff also led to an expanded theoretical model to include young adults and siblings who youth reported act as culture brokers between different settings (Cooper et al., in press). As a program director, one partner had already built on her masters' thesis in education on parent involvement. With our team she developed a hypothesis that another factor contributing to program effectiveness involves students' peers. She reasoned that the program could help youth find friends who share their dreams of college and college-based careers and that such friends can help one another achieve their goals. Our team surveyed students on these issues at the program Summer Institute and then held focus groups with students at the next program Saturday academy, showing them graphs of our findings. They explained why they had friends for whom school was important. We also asked youth what questions they would like the research team to ask at the next Summer Institute, where we will continue these activities.

Staff in the other program helped us understand that programs provide a place of belonging that is an alternative to joining a gang, and that programs allow youth to be with others who share their goals and concerns. Staff also helped us identify different subgroups of youth who need different kinds of services, including those who come to learn, those who come to see friends, and those who come because a parent is insisting. And staff helped us recognize the role of culture in sibling care, the protection of young children, gender roles, and parent-child relationships.

Benefits to Policymakers

Finally, because university-community partnerships encompass a range of perspectives and strategies, they offer valuable information to policymakers. Our findings speak to three key policy issues: resource underutilization, program replication, and maintenance of an open academic pipeline for ethnically diverse youth.

Many youth programs are underutilized (McLaughlin et al., 1994). Our findings on why youth participate in programs—including relationships with staff, fun, learning, and safety—provide a kind of formative evaluation that can be useful to policymakers, funders, and planners in improving programs. In addition, our findings suggest that low-income and minority youth and their families have hopes and dreams for the future and seek guidance on how to reach those dreams.

Program replication becomes possible when research reveals practices that could be helpful to other programs (Oden, 1995; Weiss, 1998). We set out to discover not only what programs are doing, but also how and why their services make a difference. To do this we needed to spend time listening to, observing, and trying out roles to understand how the programs were run. Building long-term partnerships with program staff is necessary to see which program elements make a difference (e.g., staff, activities, community investment, etc.)

Relationships and communication among staff influence what happens in a program. The most effective activities were those that built on youth strengths and matched their interests (such as allowing friends or siblings to attend

program activities and work on projects together); were sensitive to developmental differences; built on existing relationships between staff and participants; and involved a willingness on the part of staff to be available after hours (e.g., for follow-up phone calls and transportation).

Challenges to Successful Partnerships and Good Research

Several factors can inhibit successful partnerships and the generation of valid research findings. Collecting data in a community setting presents a special challenge (Archer et al., 1992; Groark & McCall, 1996). The following are common problems university-community partnerships confront:

Unclear Boundaries

Partnerships may blur boundaries between the research effort and the program. Researchers in the field face challenges similar to those faced by anthropologists in conducting field-based research (Lofland & Lofland, 1995); such challenges include whether to cross the line between observing and participating. Because program staff are often pressed to focus on service delivery and funding (Groark & McCall, 1996), they may try to enlist researchers to help with teaching, supervising, and transporting children, organizing field trips, or seeking funds. Researchers may also be asked to write grants or give presentations on behalf of the program. Although some of these activities may be appropriate, difficulties can arise when mutual roles are ill defined or when staff are asked to perform tasks they are not funded to do. Similarly, researchers may make demands on staff for data collection that takes time away from direct service to youth.

Problems of Organization and Management

Programs and universities are each in a constant state of development that includes staff turnover and ongoing differences of opinion between staff. Researchers can find themselves in the middle of miscommunications between staff and supervisors when factions exist within a program. In addition, when program practices are at odds with stated goals or missions, this creates problems for researchers trying to frame pertinent research questions. Likewise, a research team that lacks good communication and trust can send conflicting messages to the program. The research questions generated with the community may require the university team to seek assistance from experts outside their discipline, a difficult task at some universities.

Disparate Goals

Program staff and researchers may differ in what they want to accomplish in a collaboration. For example, program staff may not understand university requirements for informed consent; they may want researchers to investigate topics or survey children without informed consent. On the other hand, programs may want to protect the identities of participants who are legally vulnerable. Some programs do not have the time or resources to take on a university-sponsored project, or they may want results more quickly than is practical for completing data collection, entry, and analysis. Doing research in partnership takes time, and university-based researchers may have difficulty justifying the meetings, volunteer work in the community, and reports written for the community, if their institution rewards research productivity but not outreach. And stakeholders such as funders can also affect how well a collaboration works (Groark & McCall, 1996) when the research questions change in response to funders' concerns.

Different Priorities

University researchers may not be familiar with program practices or the community. They may violate social norms by not allowing youth to work together or by expecting the same youth to return to the program every day or attend all program activities. They may come with assumptions about the value of a formal education, while program staff may stress the importance of participants' ability to deal with their situation or "street smarts."

Program staff are typically not trained in research methods. They may not understand the importance of rigorous experimental design or of keeping accurate records. Planning can be difficult if methods conflict with the tenets of staff who run the program (Langman & McLaughlin, 1993). For example, staff may, understandably, put interests of participants ahead of the research schedule by taking a field trip on a day researchers plan to collect data.

Resistance and Suspicion

All parties may have concerns about the collaboration. Programs may fear research will reveal weaknesses. Partners may find meetings mutually frustrating or irrelevant, particularly if staff, youth, or researchers do not feel their views are being heard or respected (Langman & McLaughlin, 1993), or if they feel they are being told what they already know. Programs that are designed to ameliorate structural inequalities or discrimination in a community may view the university as part of the problem.

Resources for Successful Partnerships

Trust and agreed-upon boundaries are two key elements of successful partnerships. In some cases, partners have written memoranda that specify a time line and identify steps to accountability and documented success. Successful collaborations pose a question that can be answered with trust and participation of both sides (Langman & McLaughlin, 1993). They have a clear contact person in both the community and the university, and ideally some parties will be part of both the university and the community program, for instance, as staff or board members. For continuity and sustainability, both partners must be involved in fund raising and resource development (Fitzgerald & Abrams, 1997).

Universities have developed several strategies for building university-community partnerships into their administrative structure. The University of California at Santa Cruz has established the Center for Educational Partnerships, which in turn collaborates with "vertical teams" of elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, community colleges, and universities, as well as community organizations and academic outreach programs, to strengthen access of diverse groups to the academic pipeline (Moran, 1999). The University of Minnesota has a consortium that develops and sustains collaborations with local communities (Weinberg & Erickson, 1996). The Office of Child Development at the University of Pittsburgh links funding, research, and programs on issues related to children, youth, and families (McCall, Groark, Strauss, & Johnson, 1995). Departments of applied developmental science promote faculty and student work in partnership with local communities (Fisher & Osofsky, 1997; Fisher, Rau, & Colapietro, 1993; Fitzgerald et al., 1996; Lerner, 1995). Many of these collaboratives utilize University Extension, a nationwide system that has been in place in land-grant universities since the late 1800s. Cooperative extension agents serve as liaisons to the National 4-H Youth Council to create formalized university-community partnerships (Snider & Miller, 1993) and a strong research agenda for their experiential youth programs.

Finally, and perhaps paradoxically, social and political change can create common goals that spark new partnerships on behalf of

youth. For example, California Proposition 209 and the University of California Regents' SP-1 removed affirmative action for university admission as a legal remedy for the underrepresentation of ethnic minority youth in college. This policy change has prompted the development of new coalitions of educators, families, business leaders, and federal and state agencies to strengthen the ethnic diversity of students along the "academic pipeline" from kindergarten to college. University-community partnerships with community organizations, business partners, religious leaders, families, schools, and youth are building long-term, sustainable partnerships that reach across cultural and ethnic lines. At the state and national level, these coalitions are also linking private grant makers for children and families with public funders and policymakers. One example is the Fannie Mae Foundation's recent funding for fifteen universities to work in partnership with communities on housing development.

In conclusion, research can play a key role in how social service programs and youth programs are designed, funded, and run. But this will not happen as long as research is conducted in settings far removed from the venues of service delivery or university researchers confine outreach to simply "giving science away." University-community research partnerships hold promise for all stakeholders and provide potential solutions to the social divisions that split our nation and other democracies (Garcia Coll et al., 1997). These partnerships will attain increased success as we gain greater understanding of the steps needed to build and sustain them.

References

Allen, L., & Grobman, S. (1996). Multiculturalism and social policy. In E. F. Zigler, S. L. Kagan, & N. W. Hall (Eds.), *Children, families, and government: Preparing for the 21st century* (pp. 355–377). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, D., Pettigrew, T. F., & Aronson, E. (1992). Making research apply: High stakes public policy in a regulatory environment. *American Psychologist, 47*, 1233–1236.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Barber, B. L., & Crockett, L. J. (1993). Preventive interventions in early adolescence: Developmental and contextual challenges. In R.M. Lerner (Ed.), *Early adolescence: Perspectives on research, policy, and intervention* (pp. 311–323). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1992). *A matter of time: Risk and opportunity in the nonschool hours*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Castaneda, L. V., Ulanoff, S. H., & Rios, F. (1996, April). *Change with difference: The nature of schooling the whole student, the story of one Latino community-based organization*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Cooper, C. R. (1997, Fall). When diversity works: Cultural partnerships for science, policy, and youth in democracies. *Society for Research on Adolescence Newsletter*, pp. 1, 4, 7.

Cooper, C. R. (in press). Multiple selves, multiple worlds: Cultural perspectives on individuality and connectedness in adolescence. In A. Masten (Ed.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology: Cultural processes in development* (pp. 25–57). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cooper, C. R., & Denner, J. (1996, June). *Intergenerational pathways along the academic pipeline*. Paper presented at the National

Head Start Conference, Washington, DC.

Cooper, C. R., & Denner, J. (1998). Theories linking culture and psychology: Universal and community-specific processes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 559–84.

Cooper, C. R., Denner, J., & Lopez, E. M. (in press). Cultural brokers: Helping Latino children on their pathways through school. *The Future of Children*, 9.

Cooper, C. R., Jackson, J. F., Azmitia, M., Lopez, E. M., & Dunbar, N. (1995). Bridging students' multiple worlds: African American and Latino youth in academic outreach programs. In R. F. Macias & R. G. Ramos (Eds.), *Changing schools for changing students: An anthology of research on language minorities* (pp. 211–234). Santa Barbara, CA: University of California.

Denner, J., Aber, J. L., & Allen, L. (1998). *Why do adolescents take their parents' perspectives? Interactions between age, parental control, and the understanding of social rules.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Denner, J. & Dunbar, N. (1997). *Taking action: Promoting efficacy in a Latina girls' group.* Unpublished grant report, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

Denner, J., Lopez, E. M., Cooper, C. R., & Dunbar, N. (1998). *Strategies of Latino youth for reaching career goals: Links to gender, program engagement, and math grades.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Denner, J., Orellana, M. F., & Cooper, C. R. (1997, March). *Community program staff: Brokering home-school relationships for Latino youth.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Fisher, C. B., & Murray, J. P. (1996). Applied developmental science comes of age. In C. B. Fisher, J. P. Murray, & I. E. Sigel (Eds.), *Applied developmental science: Graduate training for diverse disciplines and educational settings* (pp. 1–21). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Fisher, C. B., Murray, J. P., & Sigel, I. E. (1996). *Applied developmental science: Graduate training for diverse disciplines and educational settings.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Fisher, C. B., & Osofsky, J. D. (1997). Training the applied developmental scientist for prevention and practice: Two current examples. *Social Policy Report, 11*(2), 1–18.

Fisher, C. B., Rau, J. B., & Colapietro, E. (1993). The Fordham University Doctoral Specialization in Applied Developmental Psychology. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 14*, 289–302.

Fitzgerald, H. E., & Abrams, A. (1997, April). *Applied developmental science: A scholarship-based approach to university-community collaborations.* Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, DC.

Fitzgerald, H. E., Abrams, A., Church, R. L., Votruba, J. C., & Imig, G. L. (1996). Applied developmental science at Michigan State University: Connecting university and community via programs for children, youth, and families. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*, 55–70).

Gambone, M. A., & Arbreton, A. J. A. (1997). *Safe havens: The contributions of youth organizations on healthy adolescent development.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Garcia Coll, C. T., Thorne, B., Cooper, C. R., Scott-Jones, D., Eccles, J., & Nakashima, C. (1997, April). *Beyond social categories: Issues around race, ethnicity, and social class in developmental research.* Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington, DC.

Groark, C. J., & McCall, R. B. (1996). Building successful university-community human service agency collaborations. In C. B. Fisher, J. P. Murray, & I. E. Sigel (Eds.), *Applied developmental science: Graduate*

training for diverse disciplines and educational settings (pp. 237–252). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1991). Community organizations as family: Endeavors that engage and support adolescents. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*, 623–627.

Higgins, C. (1988). *Youth motivation: At-risk youth talk to program planners*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Kretzmann, J. P., & McKnight, J. L. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward mobilizing a community's assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.

Langman, J. L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). Collaborate or go it alone? Tough decisions for youth policy. In S. B. Heath & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Identity and inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender* (pp. 147–175). New York: Teachers College Press.

Laosa, L. (1990). Population generalizability, cultural sensitivity, and ethical dilemmas. In C. B. Fisher & W. W. Tryon (Eds.), *Ethics in applied developmental psychology: Emerging issues in an emerging field* (pp. 227–252). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lerner, R. M. (1995). Developing individuals within changing contexts: Implications of developmental contextualism for human development research, policy and programs. In T. A. Kindermann & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Development of person-context relations* (pp. 13–37). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lerner, R. M., & Galambos, N. L. (1998). Adolescent development: Challenges and opportunities for research, programs, and policies. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 413–446.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. H. (1995). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (3rd edit.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Lorion, R. P., Iscoe, I., DeLeon, P. H., & VandenBos, G. R. (Eds.). (1996). *Psychology and public policy: Balancing public service and professional need*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Mayo, M. (1997). Partnerships for regeneration and community development. *Critical Social Policy, 17*, 3–26.

McAdoo, H. (1990). The ethics of research and intervention with ethnic minority parents and their children. In C. B. Fisher & W. W. Tryon (Eds.), *Annual advances in applied developmental psychology (Vol. 4): Ethics in applied developmental psychology: Emerging issues in an emerging field* (pp. 273–283). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

McCall, R. B., Groark, C. J., Strauss, M. S., & Johnson, C. N. (1995). An experiment promoting interdisciplinary applied human development: The University of Pittsburgh model. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 16*, 593–612.

McHale, S. M., & Lerner, R. M. (1996). University-community collaborations on behalf of youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*, 1–7.

McLaughlin, M., Irby, M., & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McLoyd, V., & Steinberg, L. (Eds.). (1998). *Conceptual and methodological issues in the study of minority adolescents and their families*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Moran, C. (1999). *UC Santa Cruz Educational Partnership Center: Creating college-bound communities*. Santa Cruz: University of California.

Mrs. Clinton: Connect research to people's ordinary lives. (1997, Spring). *SRCD Newsletter, 40*, 1.

National Research Council Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. (1993). *Losing generations: Adolescents in high-risk settings*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Oden, S. (1995). Studying youth programs to assess influences on youth development: New roles for researchers. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 10*, 173–186.

Ostrom, C. W., Lerner, R. M., & Freel, M. A. (1995). Building the capacity of youth and families through university-community collaborations: The Development-in-Context Evaluation (DICE) Model. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 10*, 427–448.

Peterson, G. W. (1995). The need for common principles in prevention programs for children, adolescents, and families. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 10*, 470–485.

Phelan, P., Davidson, A. L., & Yu, H.C. (1991). Students' multiple worlds: Navigating the borders of family, peer, and school cultures. In P. Phelan & A. L. Davidson, (Eds.), *Cultural diversity: Implications for education* (pp. 52–88). New York: Teachers College Press.

Price, R. H., Cioci, M., Penner, W., & Trautlein, B. (1993). Webs of influence: School and community programs that enhance adolescent health and education. *Teachers College Record, 94*, 487–521.

Quinn, J. (1997). Positive effects of participation in youth organizations. In M. Rutter (Ed.), *Psychosocial disturbances in young people: Challenges for prevention* (pp. 274–304). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rapaport, R. N. (1985). Research and action. In R. N. Rapaport (Ed.), *Children, youth, and families: The action-research relationship* (pp. 1–25). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Small, S. A. (1995). Enhancing contexts of adolescent development: The role of community-based action research. In L. J. Crockett & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Pathways through adolescence: Individual development in relation to social contexts* (pp. 211–233). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Small, S. A. (1996). Collaborative, community-based research on adolescents: Using research for community change. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*, 9–22.

Smith, M. B. (1990). Psychology in the public interest: What have we done? What can we do? *American Psychologist, 45*, 530–536.

Snider, B. A., & Miller, J. P. (1993). The land-grant university system and 4-H: A mutually beneficial relationship of scholars and practitioners in youth development. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Early adolescence: Perspectives on research, policy, and intervention* (pp. 481–499). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Takanishi, R. (1993). An agenda for the integration of research and policy during early adolescence. In R. M. Lerner (Ed.), *Early adolescence: Perspectives on research, policy, and intervention* (pp. 457–469). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Takanishi, R. (1996). Changing images of adolescents: Rethinking our policies. In E. F. Zigler, S. L. Kagan, & N. W. Hall (Eds.), *Children, families, and government: Preparing for the twenty-first century* (pp. 256–267). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tharp, R., & Yamauchi, L. (1994). *Polyvocal research on the ideal Zuni classroom*. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, University of California.

Thorne, B., & Cooper, C. R. (1995). *California childhoods: Identities, contexts, and institutions on successful pathways through childhood*. Unpublished research proposal, project funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Pathways through Middle Childhood.

Weinberg, R. A., & Erickson, M. F. (1996). Minnesota's children, youth, and family consortium: A university-community collaboration. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*, 37–54.

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation* (2nd edit.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Weiss, H. B., & Greene, J. C. (1992). An empowerment partnership for family support and education programs and evalua-

tions. *Family Science Review, 5*, 131–148.
White, S. H. (1996). The relationships of developmental psychology to social policy. In E. F. Zigler, S. L. Kagan, & N. W. Hall (Eds.), Children, families, and government: Preparing for the twenty-first century (pp. 409–426). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Zeldin, S. (1995). Community-university collaborations for youth development: From theory to practice. Journal of Adolescent Research, 10, 449–469.
Zeldin, S., & Price, L. A. (1995). Creating supportive communities for adolescent development, challenges to scholars: An introduction. Journal of Adolescent Research, Creating supportive communities for adolescent development: Challenges to scholars (Special Issue), 10, 6–14.
Zervigon-Hakes, A. M. (1995). Translating research findings into large-scale public programs and policy. The Future of Children, 5, 175–191.
Zigler, E. (1998). A place of value for applied and policy studies. Child Development, 69, 532–542.

About the Authors

Jill Denner, Ph.D., is a senior research associate at ETR Associates, a nonprofit health education organization, where she develops youth programs and studies the role of communities and programs in promoting positive youth development. She was formerly a postdoctoral fellow at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Catherine R. Cooper, Ph.D., is Professor of Psychology and Education at the University of California, Santa Cruz. She works in university-community partnerships as part of the Monterey Bay Educational Consortium (MBEC), in the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Pathways through Middle Childhood, and as director of the Program on Families, Schools, Peers, and Communities of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) of the U.S. Office of Education, Research and Improvement (OERI).

Edward M. Lopez, Ph.D., recently completed his graduate degree in developmental psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Nora Dunbar, M.A., earned her master's degree in developmental psychology at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and is currently a doctoral student in the Department of Family Social Science at the University of Minnesota.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by a grant to Barrie Thorne and Catherine R. Cooper fr the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Successful Pa ays through Middle C ldhoc d and a grant to to Catherine R. Cooper, Francisco Hernandez, Jill Denner from the University of California Regents' Diversity Initiative. The author aank Elizabeth Dominguez, Rosie Ruiz, Gabe Guitierrez, Tim Haenny, Nane Alejandr Otilio Quintero, Frank Gonzales, Juan Ascencio, Jose Bracamontes, Felipe Cruz, Manuel Riv Monica Larenas, Liz Ayala, Wend Rivera, Renee Ferigo Marshall, and Robert G. Cooper for the contributions to this work. Correspondence should be addressed to Jill Denner, Ph.D., Senior Research Associate, ETR Associates, P.O. Box 1830, Santa Cruz, CA 95061-1830. Email: jilld@etr-associates.org.

Purpose

Social Policy Report (ISSN 1075-7031) is published four times a year by the Society for Research in Child Development. Its purpose is twofold: (1) to provide policymakers with objective reviews of research findings on topics of current national interest, and (2) to inform the SRCD membership about current policy issues relating to children and about the state of relevant research.

Content

The *Report* provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for policies affecting children. The Society recognizes that few policy issues are noncontroversial, that authors may well have a "point of view," but the *Report* is not intended to be a vehicle for authors to advocate particular positions on issues. Presentations should be balanced, accurate, and inclusive. The publication nonetheless includes the disclaimer that the views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Society or the editor.

Procedures for Submission and Manuscript Preparation

Articles originate from a variety of sources. Some are solicited, but authors interested in submitting a manuscript are urged to propose timely topics to the editor. Manuscripts vary in length ranging from 20 to 30 pages of double-spaced text (approximately 8,000 to 14,000 words) plus references. Authors are asked to submit hard copy and a disk, including text, references, and a brief biographical statement limited to the author's current position and special activities related to the topic.

Three or four reviews are obtained from academic or policy specialists with relevant expertise and different perspectives. Authors then make revisions based on these reviews and the editor's queries, working closely with the editor to arrive at the final form for publication.

The Committee on Child Development, Public Policy, and Public Information, which founded the *Report*, serves as an advisory body to all activities related to its publication.

Past Issues

Volume VIII (1994)

No. 1 *Children's changing access to resources: A historical perspective.* Donald J. Hernandez

No. 2 *Children in poverty: Designing research to affect policy.* Aletha C. Huston

No. 3 *Developmental effects of lead exposure in children.* Johanna Rich Tesman & Amanda Hills

No. 4 *Resiliency research: Implications for schools and policy.* Marc A. Zimmerman & Revathy Arunkumar

Volume IX (1995)

No. 1 *Escaping poverty: The promise of higher education.* Erika Kates

No. 2 *The U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child: Its relevance for social scientists.* Susan P. Limber & Målfrid Grude Flekkøy

No. 3 *Children who witness violence: The invisible victims.* Joy D. Osofsky

Volume X (1996)

No. 1 *Latin American immigration and U.S. Schools.* Claude Goldenberg

Nos. 2 & 3 *Is the emperor wearing clothes? Social policy and the empirical support for full inclusion of children with disabilities in the preschool and early elementary grades.* Bryna Siegel

Inclusion at the preschool level: An ecological systems analysis. Samuel L. Odom, Charles A. Peck, Marci Hanson, Paula J. Beckman, Ann P. Kaiser, Joan Lieber, William H. Brown, Eva M. Horn, & Ilene S. Schwartz

No. 4 *Building research and policy connections: Training and career options for developmental scientists.* Amy R. Susman-Stillman, Joshua L. Brown, Emma K. Adam, Clancy Blair, Robin Gaines, Rachel A. Gordon, Ann Marie White, & Sheri R. Wynn

No. 5 *A reconceptualization of the effects of undernutrition on children's biological, psychosocial, and behavioral development.* Ernesto Pollitt, Mari Golub, Kathleen Gorman, Sally Grantham-McGregor, David Levitsky, Beat Schurch, Barbara Strupp, & Theodore Wachs

Volume XI (1997)

No. 1 *Schooling, the hidden curriculum, and children's conceptions of poverty.* Judith A. Chafel

No. 2 *Training the applied developmental scientist for prevention and practice: Two current examples.* Celia Fisher & Joy Osofsky

No. 3 *Public policy schools as opportunities for developmental scientists: An overview and illustration.* Rachel A. Gordon & P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale

Volume XII (1998)

No. 1 *Fathers' involvement with children: Perspectives from developing countries.* Patrice L. Engle & Cynthia Breaux

No. 2 *Investigating child care subsidy: What are we buying?* Helen Raikes

No. 3 *Implications of the 1996 welfare legislation for children: A research perspective.* Martha Zaslow, Kathryn Tout, Sheila Smith, & Kristin Moore

No. 4 *Improving the life chances of children in poverty: Assumptions and what we have learned.* Robert G. St.Pierre & Jean I. Layzer

Social Policy Report *is a quarterly publication of the Society for Research in Child Development. The* Report *provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for the policies affecting children. Copyright of the articles published in the* Report *is maintained by SRCD. Statements appearing in the* Report *are the views of the author and do not imply endorsement by the Editor or by SRCD.*

Editor: Nancy G. Thomas
phone: (970) 925-5516 - fax: (970) 544-0662
New e-mail: ngthomas@sopris.net

Subscriptions available at $15.00 to nonmembers of SRCD, single issues at $4.80, and multiple copies at reduced rates. Write or phone:

SRCD Executive Office • University of Michigan • 505 East Huron, Suite 301 • Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522
(734) 998-6578

SRCD Executive Office
University of Michigan
505 East Huron, Suite 301
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 587
Ann Arbor, MI

SOCIAL POLICY REPORT
Society for Research in Child Development

Volume XIII, Number 2 1999

Perspectives on Father Involvement: Research and Policy

Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda **Natasha Cabrera**

In this report we describe the state of current research on father involvement and point to ways in which research findings might inform the economic and public policies that affect fathers. We do not intend an extensive review of the literature (see Lamb, 1997); rather, our goal is to integrate research and policies on father involvement into a framework that emphasizes the synergistic relationship between the two. A central aim of this report is to highlight limitations of past research and policies on father involvement and to raise questions that we hope will guide future efforts in this area. It is through this merging of research and policy that a richer appreciation of the ways in which different dimensions of father involvement lead to positive relationships with children will be realized. How can knowledge about father involvement, the predictors of involvement, and the influences of involvement on children be translated into policies that support fathers, families and children? How do current social policies guide the research questions that are (or should be) addressed in this area? What role have socio-cultural and historical trends played in determining the nature of research and policies on father involvement?

Social, economic, and political events of the past ten years have placed fathers in the national spotlight. As a result we are seeing a shift in the way federal agencies collect data on fathers and how they design policies to promote fathers' involvement in the lives of their children. This shift has generated increased interest in what fathers do—economically, emotionally, and instrumentally—and has led to an unprecedented surge of work by researchers and policymakers concerned with child and family well-being. At the same time we have become aware of the limitations of national data on fathers. The federal government and private foundations are encouraging researchers, educators, and practitioners to examine all aspects of fathering,

Contents

Social trends and policies 2
Defining father 3
Fatherhood Initiative 4
Research on fathers 5
Characterizing father involvement . . . 5
Child outcomes 7
Predictors of father involvement 9
Public policies and father involvement . 12
Legislative policies 12
Public education and programs 13
Where are we now 14
Where are we going next 16
COMMENTARY by Ross A. Thompson . 27

PS 029155

©1999 Society for Research in Child Development. All rights reserved.

including how men become fathers, the nature of father-child interactions, the motives underlying father involvement, the barriers to involvement, and the design of effective policies and programs to include fathers. This growing interest is, in turn, creating a new body of work that focuses on expanded definitions of father (e.g., biological vs. social), typologies of father involvement, and measures of father involvement and father-child relationships. This important work is beginning to link research to policy.

Major developments in social trends and policies have been a catalyst for the expanding interest in fathers that we see at present. One outcome of these social trends has been a reconfiguration of what had long been considered the traditional family—in which a father's role was that of breadwinner. Consequently, we are beginning to adjust both popular and scholarly conceptualizations of fathers, mothers, and families as we approach the 21st century. This reconceptualization includes adopting a more flexible and expanded definition of fatherhood (Cabrera, Tamis-LeMonda, Bradley, Hofferth, & Lamb, in press).

We begin this report with a discussion of recent economic, political, and social trends and events that have led to a growing interest in the father's role in the family. We review research on (1) the social roles served by fathers, (2) the different types of father involvement, (3) the child outcomes affected, (4) the direct and indirect pathways through which father involvement influences children's development, and (5) the factors that predict father involvement. We examine how public policies have affected father involvement to date and we discuss the current state of research and policies on fatherhood. We conclude with a set of recommendations for future research and policy initiatives that will be critical to advancing both theory and practice in this area.

Social Trends and Policies

Recent social trends are placing fathers in unprecedented circumstances. The most conspicuous trend during much of the 20th century has been the dramatic increase in female labor force participation. In 1950, 12% of married women with preschool children were in the work force; by 1983 that proportion had risen to half and by 1997 to two thirds of married women (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1986, 1997). Maternal employment has been accompanied by a parallel increase in the enrollment of children in nonparental care facilities. As more and more women enter the workforce, often with nonstandard work schedules, a lack of affordabie and accessible child care is causing fathers to take on increasing responsibility in the care of their children. Although fathers have always helped care for their children, their role as care provider has only recently been publicly acknowledged. In 1993 more than 1.6 million preschoolers were cared for by their fathers while their mothers were at work (Casper, 1997; Casper & O'Connell, 1998). The number of single fathers with children at home has increased by 25% in the past three years from 1.7 million in 1995 to 2.1 million in 1998. Men now comprise one sixth of the nations 11.9 million single parents (Bureau of the Census, 1998). This reflects a rising trend toward more men seeking custody and an increased acceptance by mothers, courts, and society that men can be effective parents either in cohabiting situations or on their own.

Another quite different social development that has placed men in the national spotlight is the alarming rate of father-absent families. In 1997, 24% of children lived with only their mothers (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 1998a). Almost 70% of women on welfare were unmarried when they had their first child. It has been estimated that the proportion of children who will live with only one parent at some time during their childhood will exceed 50% (Hernandez, 1993).

These divergent trends—the growing proportion of fathers-as-caregivers and increasing incidence of father absence—are creating social and cultural shifts in images of fatherhood and assumptions about men's roles. National cam-

paigns, the popular media, researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and educators are engendering a new image of the emotionally involved father (Wilkie, 1993), while they also recognize he alarming escalation of father-absent households. As a result, fathers have been elevated from relative obscurity to a central position in efforts to understand and promote children's well-being. New types of fathers are being acknowledged—in step-, recombined, and cohabiting families. All of these family types call for men—even those not biologically related—to increase their involvement in the lives of their children.

These social trends have important implications for public policies aimed at regulating and promoting certain behaviors. To date, public policies have tended to slight fathers, especially those in nontraditional families; and even in traditional nuclear families, a father's financial support was viewed as the most important and regulatable form of his involvement. Most fathers who fell outside the traditional mode were ignored.

Low-income fathers have been especially overlooked. Because many are absent from families, they also lie outside conventional policy. Thus, not surprisingly, social policy for needy families has typically focused on mothers more than fathers. Such is the case of the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (known as Welfare Reform). This new law created a block grant called Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) to replace Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). It provides funds to states to run welfare programs of their own design within broad federal guidelines. It encourages mothers' workforce participation by imposing work requirements on those who receive cash assistance for more than two years and by placing a five-year lifetime limit on mothers' eligibility for assistance. Half the states have set shorter limits. The new law also emphasizes paternity establishment for children born out of wedlock, increasing penalties for mothers who fail to cooperate, and child support enforcement.

While economic necessity and the desire of some men to participate more actively in their children's lives is helping them become more involved, there are barriers. It is argued that "gender distrust" between men and women is increasing. As low-income single women strive to obtain employment, men are left behind, often unemployed and hence undesirable as marriage partners (Furstenberg, 1998). Policymakers are now considering how to improve the prospects of these men. A plethora of programs (e.g., Baltimore Men's Start) have sprung up across the country to target men and provide job training and parenting advice. An academic organizations (e.g., National Center on Fathers and Families [NCOFF]) collects and disseminates research on fathers; advocacy groups (e.g., the Center on Fathers, Families and Public Policy) monitor the legal issues that low-income men face; and organizations provide a forum for people who run fatherhood programs (e.g., National Association of Practitioners). Activism at the community level and a widespread desire to return men to their families have motivated policymakers to include men in new policies. A "Fathers Count" bill (1998), introduced by Representative E. Clay Shaw, Jr. (who was the key author of the 1996 welfare law), would fund community groups, including religious organizations, to give low-income fathers job training and parenting advice and encourage them to marry.

Defining Father

In light of these social changes there is widespread recognition of the need to broaden the conceptualization of the father; however, the attempt to expand the definition of fathers has incited considerable debate among researchers and policymakers. Family make-up varies greatly—from single-parent, to cohabiting, to recombined. This variation implies, in turn, great diversity in father and mother roles and how

children develop and are cared for. In 1997, 68% of American children lived with two parents, down from 77% in 1980 (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 1998a). The percentage of children living with two parents is somewhat lower for children of Hispanic origin (64%) and much lower for black children (35%). That fewer children are living with both parents owes in part to a sharp rise in the percentage of births to unmarried mothers (Bumpass, Raley, & Sweet, 1995).

In addition, many children, even if born to married parents, are likely to experience parental instability and divorce. It is estimated that one third of children will spend some time in a nonmarital or stepfamily before they reach the age of 18 (Seltzer, 1994). Legal marriage is increasingly preceded or replaced by cohabiting unions (Hetherington & Henderson, 1997) and 60% of couples in first marriages will separate or divorce; of these, two thirds of women and three quarters of men will remarry (Bumpass, Sweet, & Castro-Martin, 1990). Dissolution of these stepfamilies is also increasing: 54% of remarried women and 64% of remarried men divorce again (Martin & Bumpass, 1989). This complicated family restructuring is creating what has been called the "new extended family" (Furstenberg, 1987).

These trends corroborate that a large proportion of children will grow up either without their biological father or with a stepfather and that they will encounter changing family structures that call for adjustment to new and complex interactions with parents and siblings (Hetherington & Henderson, 1997). Consequently, we are moving away from a definition of fatherhood based solely on biology to one that encompasses other configurations.

A father then can be "biological" and/or "social"; he can be "legal" or "nonlegal." A biological father is one who through either paternity establishment or self-report identifies a child as his own. A social father, on the other hand, is one who demonstrates parental characteristics that make him "like a father" to the child. He holds the expectations and obligations that society prescribes for fathers—whether he is biologically related (e.g., grandfather, uncle), associated with the child through marital ties (e.g., stepfather), or otherwise socially related to the mother (e.g., in cohabitation, as friend). A husband can become the legal father of his wife's child through adoption. A nonlegal father is one who cohabits with or otherwise has a nonmarital relationship with the child's mother. Divorced fathers with joint legal custody have the right to make decisions about their children's lives, regardless of where the children live (Seltzer, 1998). States may make a distinction between legal decision-making rights and physical custody—the latter designating which parent lives with the child.

In the case of stepfathers, because there are no clear legal or social norms defining their role (Hetherington & Henderson, 1997), negotiating their position as a new family member presents a significant challenge. In fact, stepparents have no legal status; it is the biological parent who bears responsibility for all facets of childbearing—discipline, consent to medical care, or access to school records (Ramsey, 1994). With a few exceptions that vary from state to state, stepchildren and stepparents are considered "legal strangers" (Mahoney, 1994). A stepparent's legal rights and responsibilities change when he or she formally adopts stepchildren. Given the varied "types" of father, identifying those attributes that define positive fatherhood is crucial to understanding the influence of father involvement on children's development across a range of social settings.

Fatherhood Initiative

The Fatherhood Initiative was an outgrowth of these socio-historical changes, serving as a further catalyst for the current surge of interest in father involvement. In 1994 the Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics was created to coordinate data collection efforts across federal agencies. On June 16,

1995, President Clinton issued a one-page memorandum requesting that these agencies assume greater leadership in promoting father involvement. Agencies were asked to review their programs and policies with an eye to strengthening the role of fathers in families and highlighting fathers' contributions to their children's well-being. A further goal was to improve data collection on fathers.

One activity of the Forum was to coordinate a series of workshops, held in 1996 and 1997, on male fertility, family formation, and fathering. This series came to be known as the "Fatherhood Initiative." Its purpose was to examine how fathers are conceptualized in social policies and how research and policy can jointly strengthen the father's role in the family.

The Fatherhood Initiative raised several important issues:

(1) Because family situations and structures vary greatly, father and mother roles also vary in ways that affect how children develop and are cared for.

(2) Although the father role has undergone substantial change, most social programs have ignored fathers' influence on their children, families, and community.

(3) Fathers' importance to families is not diminished by differences in living arrangements or financial status.

(4) Responsible fatherhood may affect fathers' own personal development and their intent to engage in economically productive and prosocial behaviors.

(5) We know little about the commitment and existing barriers to fathering that low-income fathers experience.

The Fatherhood Initiative led to recommendations for improving data collection on the nature and outcomes of father involvement. Researchers and policymakers were urged to expand their perspective: to attend to both marital and nonmarital relationships, from the vantage of women and men; to conduct longitudinal studies that follow the process of fertility and family formation across the life course; to improve data gathering on the motives, attitudes, and intentions underlying childbearing of men and women in all types of relationships; and to investigate further the meaning of fatherhood, the motivation underlying fatherhood, and the impact that father involvement has on child development in different cultural and ethnic groups (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 1998b).

Research on Fathers

Characterizing Father Involvement

Interest in the influence of fathers has grown steadily since the turn of the century and has accelerated since the 1960s (Lamb, 1997). Efforts to characterize father involvement and understand its effect on children's development have spawned four areas of research on

(1) roles that fathers play in the family,

(2) types of father involvement,

(3) child outcomes, and

(4) different pathways of influence.

Fathers' roles in the family. Traditionally, the father's social role within the family has been seen as mainly instrumental—as breadwinner. But fathers fill other roles, such as that of caregiver, and these roles are shifting as family structures change (Greene, Hearn, & Emig, 1996). Increased maternal employment, periods of economic decline, joint work schedules, flexible hours (including flex-time), irregular work schedules, part-time employment, job sharing, and home-based work all make it more likely that children will be cared for by their father, and for longer periods of time (Casper & O'Connell, 1998; Presser, 1995). Consequently, an ideal of the father as coparent is emerging (Pleck & Pleck, 1997).

A review of research on fathers as child care providers concludes that they are more likely to care for their children when family income is low and work schedules do not overlap (Casper & O'Connell, 1998). In one assessment of mar-

ried households with two wage earners (using the Survey of Income and Program Participation data set for 1991 and 1993), it was found that fathers are increasing their child care responsibility—most of it primary care. In 1988, 1.5 million fathers cared for their children; in 1991 this was 1.9 million, in 1993, 1.6 million (Casper & O'Connell, 1998). In 1991, 23% of men (1.4 million) with preschoolers whose wives worked were acting as primary caretakers, up from 17% in 1977 (O'Connell, 1993). In addition, in hard times the more income a wife has relative to her husband, the more likely the husband is to care for his children. Thus, changes in macroeconomic conditions affect the interplay of father care, work schedule, and family income (Brayfield, 1995; Casper & O'Connell, 1998).

The "availability hypothesis," that is, the more time a husband has to care for his children the more likely he is to do so, is supported by the finding that men who are in blue-collar jobs and are lower paid, compared to upper middle-class professionals, are more involved with their children. Thus, the combination of economic necessity and the steep cost of center day care finds men spending significantly more time caring for their children than they did 20 years ago (Levine & Pittinsky, 1997).

This trend of fathers assuming greater responsibility for the care of their young children is likely to continue into the next century. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that the largest job growth through 2006 will be in low-wage jobs, many of which entail night and weekend shifts and will be held more and more by women. Younger workers with less seniority are likely to get these shifts and are more likely than older workers to be raising children. Split-shift arrangements for care characterize one quarter of all two-earner couples in the U.S. and one third of all two-earner couples with children under age 5 (Presser, 1994). Not all father care stems from economic necessity; however. Some young couples expect to coparent, and some men are taking advantage of the opportunity to be the father they wish they had (Pruett, 1987).

Types of father involvement. Investigators continue to struggle with what it means to be an "involved father." A limited focus on father absence or presence, visitation frequency, or provision of child support reinforces the narrow view of father as economic provider. In contrast, the social construct of father involvement has recently been elaborated to include types and frequency of father-child interactions and the emotional attachment between father and child.

Three components of father involvement have been proposed (Lamb, Pleck, Charnov, & Levine, 1987):

(1) Engagement—a father's experience of direct contact and shared interactions with his child in the form of caretaking, play, or leisure;

(2) Accessibility—a father's presence and availability to the child, irrespective of the nature or extent of interactions between father and child; and

(3) Responsibility—a father's understanding and meeting of his child's needs, including the provision of economic resources to the child, and the planning and organizing of children's lives.

This three-part framework lends itself to further analysis of father involvement. Some investigators have distinguished between formal and informal forms of child support when assessing a father's financial responsibilities to the child (Greene & Moore, 1996). Others have distinguished among types of engagement, including play, direct care (e.g., diapering), and indirect care (e.g., washing baby clothes). Quantity and quality of care have also been analyzed separately (Parke, 1996).

As yet, it is unclear which of these components of father involvement affect which outcomes in children. Some researchers suggest that the assumption of responsibility, which is often neglected in survey studies, may be the most important component of father involvement (Working Group on Conceptualizing Male Parenting, 1997). In the case of nonresident fathers, for example, provision of child support is the

most important dimension of father involvement (Argys, Peters, Brooks-Gunn, & Smith, 1998; Greene, Halle, Le Menestrel, & Moore, 1998). Others suggest that qualitative characteristics of father-child interactions are central (Easterbrooks & Goldberg, 1984).

Child Outcomes

The developmental outcomes in children that are most affected by dimensions of father involvement constitute a third area of research interest. Here findings are sometimes mixed and contradictory owing to variation among studies in the ages of children and outcomes assessed, as well as differences in definitions of "father" and the father's residency status.

Different child ages and outcomes. Although father involvement appears to affect aspects of children's development from the first months of life, researchers have yet to systematically assess the extent to which specific child outcomes are affected by specific forms of father involvement at particular stages in development.

For young children, a father's emotional investment, attachment, and provision of resources are all associated with child well-being, cognitive development, and social competence (Lamb, 1997; Marsiglio et al., 1998; MacDonald & Parke, 1984; Radin, 1982). In some studies, father involvement continues to be linked to children's abilities (e.g., IQ), taking into account other factors often associated with involvement, such as family income, neonatal health, and paternal age (e.g., Yogman, Kindlon, & Earls, 1995).

A father's absolute levels of engagement and the influence of that engagement will differ at different points in his child's development (Pleck, 1997). Paternal care, compared to other types of child care, during the child's first year of life has a relatively large positive impact on developmental outcomes. But children in center care in the second and third years have slightly better cognitive outcomes than children who are cared for by their fathers (Averett, Gennetian, & Peters, 1997).

During middle childhood, father involvement has been found to relate to children's school success. A recent analysis of data from the 1996 National Household Education Survey showed that father involvement (e.g., attending a school meeting, attending a parent-teacher conference, and volunteering at the school) in both single-father and two-parent families was positively associated with children's academic achievement and enjoyment of school. For a nonresident father, it is active participation in his child's life (including schooling), rather than sheer amount of contact, that makes a difference (Nord, 1997).

The benefits of father involvement for children's schooling extend to adolescence as well. Adolescents who have a strong attachment to their in-residence biological or stepfather have been found to have better educational, behavioral, and emotional outcomes (Furstenberg & Harris, 1993). High father involvement and increasing closeness, more than involvement alone, protect adolescents from engaging in delinquent behavior and experiencing emotional distress (Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998).

Different types of fathers. What do expanded definitions of father and different residency arrangements imply for child outcomes? As yet, the influence of nontraditional families on children's development is not well understood. But new family structures challenge the notion that biological relatedness explains fathers' investment in children. Some biological fathers can be quite indifferent to their children, while some stepfathers, or other father figures, can be extremely involved.

For children, stepfamilies present a mix of strengths and problems. While some children adapt well to a new family structure (Hetherington & Henderson, 1997), others have more difficulty. This challenge is best understood within a multidimensional framework, which encompasses constitutional factors of the child (e.g., temperament), shared family and extrafamilial environments (e.g., SES, parenting), and

unshared family and extra-familial environments (e.g., peer networks). How these factors combine to affect father-child relationships, and how such relationships affect children's development, are yet to be examined.

With respect to differences in legal status, in the infant and toddler years child support is as likely to come from never-married fathers as from fathers who are divorced or separated. Over time, however, continued support is more likely to come from previously married men, perhaps because unmarried and never-married fathers are less experienced and may think they have less influence on their children than divorced or separated fathers (McKenry, McKelvey, Leigh, & Wark, 1996).

In the case of nonresident fathers, the role of father involvement for children's development is especially unclear. In many studies a father's nonresident status—whether through never being married or through divorce—has been shown to lead to a father's withdrawal and alienation from his child, seriously jeopardizing the child's attachment to him (Furstenberg & Harris, 1983; Nord & Zill, 1996; Zill, Morrison, & Coiro, 1993). In many cases a nonresident father's involvement is limited to the provision of child support. The relationship between child support and father involvement is complex, however; ad it is unclear whether it is the legislating of child support that enhances father involvement or whether it is the inverse, that it is a father's own desire to be involved that ensures support payments. An evaluation of the Teenage Parent Demonstration, an intervention targeting teenage mothers and fathers in three inner-city areas, found that social and economic support appear to be complements rather than independent factors. A father who spends time with his children is also more likely to buy them necessities and provide monetary support to the mother. This trend notwithstanding, the vast majority of nonresident fathers in this sample provided relatively little economic support and social contact to their children (Rangaranjan & Gleason, 1998).

A summary of several investigations of nonresident fathers, based on national data and large-scale surveys (Greene et al., 1998), revealed little evidence for the influence of nonresident father involvement on child outcomes. Yet many studies have found that child support is more beneficial to children (i.e., linked to more years in school, higher academic achievement, and reduced behavior problems) than other sources of income (e.g., Knox & Bane, 1994; McLanahan, Seltzer, Hanson, & Thomas, 1994). Such benefits can hold for absentee as well as resident fathers. Analysis of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth-Child (NLSY-C) found that receipt of child support related positively to cognitive test scores, perceived scholastic competence, reading and math scores on standardized tests, and behavioral measures, over and above its contribution to total income; these effects vary, however, by race and reason for the father's absence (Argys et al., 1998; King, 1994). Some researchers have found a strong association between child support and child outcomes, especially in the domain of cognitive development (Graham, Beller, & Hernandez, 1994; King, 1994). Others have found significant child-support effects on school achievement, but not on measures of the home environment (Knox, 1996). Evidence also indicates positive effects of child-support income on cognitive test scores measured during adolescence, but not on later outcome measures such as educational attainment, earnings, and labor market experience (Peters & Mullis, 1997). The differential effects of child support dollars on children's outcomes may be linked to the mother-father agreement. Cooperative parents tend to spend more of their child support income on their children because they agree on how it is to be spent (Argys & Peters, 1996).

Different pathways of influence. A father can influence his child's development directly, e.g., through teaching in one-on-one interaction. Or his influence may play out indirectly, e.g., through his relationship with the mother or his role as breadwinner.

In keeping with the tripartite framework of involvement proposed by Lamb et al. (1987), a father's engagement with his child will likely exert a direct influence on development. Fathers, like mothers, establish an important attachment relationship with the child. They directly offer advice, information, guidance, and emotional and intellectual support, thereby inculcating knowledge, self-esteem, and a sense of security in children. Fathers' accessibility may likewise offer children a sense of security and attachment, although the effect of actual engagement may be stronger.

A father's responsibility, in the form of financial support, can affect his child through its influence on the economic structure of the household—thus determining, for example, whether or not the child lives in poverty. We know that poverty is strongly associated with low academic achievement, psychosocial problems, and delinquency and crime. To the extent that a father's economic support circumvents poverty, such resources can have long-term effects on children. Indeed, the absence of a resident father is consistently correlated with childhood poverty; the poverty rate for fatherless families is five times that of two-parent families.

Father involvement may also exert indirect influences on children's development through its effect on the mother-child relationship. In a study of 2-year-olds, researchers found marital quality, the quality of parent-child relationships, and child outcomes to be strongly interrelated (Gable, Crnic, & Belsky, 1994). Moreover, the relationship between a father and mother may affect a mother's behavior. Father involvement during the prenatal period has been shown to affect a mother's own health care during pregnancy—more so than factors such as maternal income and educational attainment (Anderson & Stanley, 1976). This association is strikingly demonstrated by the finding that the infant mortality rate, which is closely linked to mothers' prenatal care, is lower for married high-school drop-outs than for college-educated unmarried mothers (Sullivan, 1992).

For nonresident fathers the indirect effects of father involvement have gained much empirical support. For example, child support payments influence parent-child and mother-father relationships, which in turn affect children's well-being by increasing father-child contact and lessening conflict between parents (McLanahan et al., 1994). Child support dollars may also indirectly affect children by reducing reliance on welfare (Knox, 1996). Some researchers distinguish between cooperative and noncooperative awards, finding that voluntary child support, compared to no support or court-ordered support, improves cognitive outcomes—perhaps because it has less negative effect on family process (Argys et al., 1998).

It may be that for many children high levels of parental conflict undo the benefits of nonresident fathers' involvement (Amato & Rezac, 1994; Doherty, Kouneski, & Erickson, 1998). Differences in level of parental conflict across studies may explain why documented associations between nonresident father involvement and children's cognitive and behavioral outcomes vary (Furstenberg, Morgan, & Allison, 1987; Graham et al., 1994; King, 1994; Knox & Bane, 1994; McLanahan et al., 1994).

Predictors of Father Involvement

What factors support and predict positive father involvement? What factors obstruct involvement? Father involvement is likely affected by multiple interacting systems operating over the life course, including a father's mental health, expectations, family relations, support networks, community and culture, the child's own characteristics, and even public policies.

Mental health. Findings on the mental health of fathers point to its importance to involvement. Paternal depression and aspects of personality have been found to predict the quality of father-infant attachment and interaction (Belsky, 1996; Ferketich & Mercer, 1995; Jain, Belsky, & Crnic, 1996). Parenting stress has also been found to be negatively associated with security of father-child relationships (Jarvis & Creasey, 1991), quality of father-infant interac-

tions at 4 months of age (Noppe, Noppe, & Hughes, 1991), and father nurturance toward an ill infant (Darke & Goldberg, 1994).

Expectations about fatherhood. In another vein, fathers' expectations about being a father are associated with various measures of father involvement. In one study fathers' attitudes and reports about their infants and their role as fathers predicted a secure father-infant attachment at 12 months (Cox, Owen, Henderson, & Margand, 1992). In another study changes in father identity and the salience of fatherhood after divorce appeared to affect involvement over time (Ihinger-Tallman, Pasley, & Buehler, 1995).

Related to expectations is the notion of intendedness, that is, the extent to which a father intended or welcomed the birth of his child. Compared to extensive research on mothers' intendedness, we know little about this aspect of fathers and its relationship to involvement (Brown & Eisenberg, 1995; Henshaw, 1998). The research literature suggests that a father's "positive parenting" may be strongly associated with whether the pregnancy was intended (Brown & Eisenberg, 1995). A recent analysis of a 23-year panel study of mothers and their children found long-term negative effects of unwanted and mistimed childbearing on children's self-esteem, suggesting that parents may be less involved and supportive with children whose birth was unintended (Axinn, Barber, & Thornton, 1998).

Relationship with child's mother. Investigators have found that a father who has a positive relationship with the mother of his child is likely to be more involved in his child's life. Fathers in positive marriages are more likely to have secure infants (Belsky, 1996), positive attitudes toward their children and their role as a parent (Cox, Owen, Lewis, & Henderson, 1989), and low levels of parenting stress (Cowan & Cowan, 1987).

In a study of African American fathers, those who were more committed to their families fed and comforted their infants more often (Hossain & Roopnarine, 1994). In contrast, fathers who were involved in poor marital relationships had a greater negative effect on their children's development than fathers who were not married to their child's mother. Only a third of the fathers with poor marital relationships had regular contact with their children, with less than a third of those developing a strong bond with them (Furstenberg & Harris, 1993). Other studies have found that unstable or hostile mother-father relationships interfere with an unmarried fathers positive involvement with his child, whereas positive relationships support father involvement (Coley & Chase-Lansdale, 1998). Indeed, a father who fails to provide appropriate economic support to his child is quick to acknowledge resentment toward the mother of his child (Furstenberg, Sherwood, & Sullivan, 1992).

A mother's expectations and attitudes may also influence father-child relations. Research suggests, for example, that mothers may discourage father involvement in domestic and child care activities owing to their belief that fathers are incompetent in or unaccustomed to performing such tasks (Pleck, 1983). Both a mother's views about the importance of father involvement and actual satisfaction with his involvement predict the frequency of father involvement (DeLuccie, 1995). A mother's crucial role as gatekeeper in the case of nonresident fathers may also act as a barrier to father involvement (Allen & Doherty, 1996; Wattenberg, 1993).

Family of origin. It is also important to examine a father's relationship with other family members, friends, his partner's family, and with members of his own family of origin. In one study, men who received more emotional support from their work and family relations had more secure infants (Belsky, 1996). In another, fathers' memories of their own childhood experiences affected their involvement with their children and the security of the father-child relationship (Cowan & Cowan, 1987; Volling & Belsky, 1992). Similarly, in a study of Native Americans, it was found that greater participation by a father's own father in his upbringing was associated with greater paternal involvement (Williams, Radin, & Coggins, 1996). Men who want

to be actively involved in their children's lives may have difficulty if they had fathers who were poor role models or spent little time with them growing up.

Background and contextual factors. A father's economic status clearly affects his ability to provide adequate child support and may ultimately affect his relationship with both his partner and child. More-educated fathers play with and teach their children more than do less-educated fathers (Jain et al., 1996), and fathers' academic achievement is associated with the amount of time spent as primary caregivers (Williams et al., 1996). A father's job loss is associated with negative outcomes for the child, and fathers in poor and welfare families, particularly those facing chronic poverty, are less involved in their adolescent children's lives (Perloff & Buckner, 1996). Yet the effects of temporary unemployment are different for fathers of preschoolers. Fathers who are unemployed or who have a flexible work schedule are more likely to care for their children (Casper & O'Connell, 1998).

Where the father lives in relation to his child's residence predicts father involvement. For nonresident fathers, for instance, a father who lives in the same state as his child is five times as likely to provide formal child support, three times more likely to provide informal child support, and six times more likely to visit regularly (Greene & Moore, 1996). Among unmarried African American parents in Baltimore, only 13% of the young adults surveyed reported a strong bond with their biological father if he had not lived with them, compared to 50% of those who had lived with their fathers (Furstenberg & Harris, 1993).

Socio-cultural ideologies and prescriptions about father involvement may also affect fathers' views about their role as father and the investment they make in their children's lives. Although many women see themselves as advocates for children's well-being, men are less likely to define themselves in such an activist, or nurturing, role. Moreover, the prescribed roles of fathers—as breadwinner, caregiver, emotional nurturer, and role model—are likely to vary across ethnic and cultural boundaries.

Child characteristics. The father-child relationship, as with all social relationships, is a transactional process—a father's involvement will be affected by his child's characteristics, and the child's responses and behaviors will be affected by the father's characteristics and behaviors. "Different children induce responses from different parts of parental repertoires. The child in turn reinforces or fails to reinforce the parent behavior which is evoked" (Bell, 1968, p. 89). Little is known, however, about how child characteristics affect a father's reactions to his child and his investment in the father role. A father's involvement may vary with the child's temperament or gender, for instance. Some fathers may find it trying to engage in responsive and reciprocal interactions with babies who have difficult temperaments; others may interact differently with their sons and daughters (Cox et al., 1989; Lamb, 1997; Parke & O'Leary, 1976). Researchers have yet to investigate the role of child characteristics in moderating associations between paternal behaviors and child outcomes, though theoretical models have been proposed to explain how different children might be differentially affected by similar experiences (Belsky, 1998).

Public policies. Finally, as discussed in the next section, public policies have an impact on the amount, frequency, and type of father involvement. For some fathers, child support laws, which as they now stand are not linked to visitation rights, are a deterrent to child contact. Similarly, parental leave policies make it difficult for a father to take time away from work to take care of his child. Most employers do not offer parental leave, and when it is offered, it is unpaid (Parke & Brott, 1999). This lack of support may create a disincentive for men to be more involved in the care of their children.

Public Policies and Father Involvement

A purpose of public policy is to regulate or promote certain behaviors. Paternity establishment and child support enforcement, targeted mainly toward nonresident custodial fathers, have been key features of policies aimed at encouraging fathers to remain involved with and economically responsible for their children. In addition, policies affecting custody, welfare, family leave, and public education have an impact on the quality and frequency of father involvement.

Legislative Policies

Paternity establishment and child support. Recent federal and state legislation is designed to strengthen child support enforcement and paternity establishment (Brown & Eisenberg, 1995). The Family Support Act of 1988 requires states to establish paternity for all children born of nonmarital unions and to require all unmarried fathers to pay child support until their children reach age 18. Summaries of the effect of this law report an increase in the percentage of children, born outside of marriage, who have both paternity established and a child support award (McLanahan, Seltzer, Hanson, & Thomas, 1995).

Successful child support collection is a key area of the current welfare reform law, which is aimed at helping public assistance recipients leave the welfare rolls and move into self-sufficiency. A 1984 legislative measure stipulated that families receive the first $50 of child support paid monthly; the remainder would go to the state to help offset the costs of AFDC (Garfinkel, McLanahan, Meyer, & Seltzer, 1998). In contrast, welfare reform gives states flexibility in determining how they collect child support dollars, and consequently there is wide variation across states. While some states have chosen to continue or eliminate the set-aside, Wisconsin is experimenting with allowing recipients to keep the entire amount of child support collected (Garfinkel et al., 1998).

Custodial parents who apply for public assistance must take an active role in establishing paternity and pursuing child support. Individual states have developed strategies for collecting child support. For example, in 1997 Virginia launched the Virginia's Kids First Campaign, which has netted $25 million from noncustodial parents who owed back support. Methods of collection included letters to delinquent fathers, arrests, use of boots to disable cars, and notices to suspend drivers and hunting and fishing licenses. An important aspect of child support legislation is that it is not linked to visitation rights. It is likely, however, that strengthening fathers' financial obligations to their children also strengthens their involvement with them.

Given this state variation in how child support laws are designed and implemented, it is difficult to get a national picture of its effects. Researchers anticipate, however, that some may have unintended consequences and might discourage family formation, paternity establishment, and father involvement. Father involvement may be jeopardized, for example, when a father is punished for nonpayment. In states that keep a substantial portion of the child support received or reduce mothers' welfare benefits, men and women often decide not to declare paternity so that any payments the father makes go directly to the child and mother (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994; Anderson, 1993; Doherty et al., 1998; Wattenberg, 1993).

Custody laws. Custody laws, which typically favor the mother, may curtail fathers' involvement with their children (Braver & O'Connell, 1998). Many nonresident fathers may resist supporting their children because they lack control over the allocation of resources within the resident parent's household (Weiss & Willis, 1985). As custody laws become more gender neutral, however, shared custody, which has implications for both child support and father involvement, is becoming more prevalent. Sole mother custody is still the dominant arrangement in divorce cases, but shared custody is on the rise (Cancian

& Meyer, 1998). Joint legal custody, in most cases, is associated with increased father involvement and can be beneficial for children and parents (Seltzer, 1998).

Welfare reform. The current welfare reform law puts greater emphasis on paternity establishment and encourages marriage and the two-parent family. This family structure stands to benefit children, even taking into account differences in family income, because, among other benefits, it facilitates a father's contact with his children (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994). In contrast, children growing up in a mother-only family report higher levels of economic vulnerability and other negative consequences (McLanahan & Sandefeur, 1994).

Parental leave. In 1993 President Clinton signed the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) that allowed parents to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave per year to care for a newborn or adopted child or another family member who is ill. The federal law further restricted these benefits to those working in businesses with 50 or more employees, employed for a full year, and working at least 1,250 hours during the year prior to the leave. Only about 10% of U.S. worksites and slightly fewer than half of employed fathers are covered (Parke & Brott, 1999). Before the passage of FMLA, states had similar family leave policies (Klerman & Liebowitz, 1997). Paid parental leave in the U.S. is rare. In 1993 only 3% of medium and large businesses and 1% of small businesses offered parental leave (Blau, Ferber, & Winkler, 1998). Only 1% of fathers in either the public or the private sector are eligible for at least some paid paternity leave. The rates for mothers are not much better.

Who takes parental leave? Fathers are much less likely than mothers to take parental leave; also they take less time off. In the U.S. it has been estimated that although 91% of fathers do take at least some leave, they take on average only about 5 days of leave when their child is born (Hyde, Essex, & Horton, 1993). It is interesting to note in one study that when fathers took time off from work, they were more likely to use paid vacation or sick leave than parental leave, which most often is unpaid. Fathers may not take advantage of family leave policies for various reasons: they typically earn more than mothers and cannot afford the loss of salary; the "daddy track" can be detrimental to their career; and many companies do not advise employees about their eligibility for paternal leave (Parke & Brott, 1999). Despite these obstacles, the percentage of fathers who take family leave is growing (Pleck, 1997).

Public Education and Programs

The recent cultural shift in how men are viewed within the family has major implications for public education and intervention programs. Targeted changes in behavior brought about by public policies can have an indirect impact on other outcomes of interest. Research, for example, indicates that men who have greater income, education, self-esteem, and parenting knowledge and egalitarian sex-role attitudes tend to be more involved with their children. Thus, public education efforts aimed at helping men become better fathers stand to benefit fathers and children. New concern for fathers has been the impetus for thousands of state and federal programs meant to help fathers, especially unmarried and adolescent males, through job training/search and employment, parent training, and school involvement (e.g., in Head Start). Unfortunately, evaluation of the effect of these programs is scant.

Programs for low-income men fall into two types. One endorses a "responsible fatherhood" approach that focuses on marriage as a primary goal. The opposing ideology provides men with training and education, which makes them more marriageable in the long-term. An example of the first, the Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization, takes a cultural, faith-based approach, with marriage as an explicit goal. In contrast, programs like Parents' Fair Share enlist the support of child support officials, social service agencies, and labor agencies in providing men with counseling sessions, reduced child support payments, and job clubs and training classes;

marriage is not an explicit goal. A recent evaluation of this latter program, however, revealed no gains in employment or earnings and had only modest success in enhancing child support payments. It is possible that men enrolled in the program received little actual job and skill training (Ron Mincy, personal communication).

Where Are We Now? Current Research and Policy

As a direct outcome of social changes to family economics and structure, and in response to the Fatherhood Initiative, a number of new research and policy efforts have been initiated over the past couple of years. These ongoing initiatives promise to extend our knowledge about the role of fathers in their children's lives and the role of public policies in supporting father involvement.

Current Research Initiatives

Public attention and academic research on fathers has led to the creation of new research programs across the country. We briefly discuss four national initiatives, which are either ongoing or will be in the field by the year 2000. These are the Early Head Start Evaluation, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Birth Cohort, Fragile Families, and the Welfare Studies. These investigations improve past research on at least five fronts by

(1) collecting nationally representative and longitudinal data on men in the context of families and communities.
(2) collecting information from the fathers themselves.
(3) collecting data from men of diverse ethnic and socioeconomic background.
(4) representing partnerships between public and private organizations.
(5) providing empirical data on how fathers, especially low-income fathers, interact with their children, what sustains the father-infant relationship, and how public policies can foster responsible fathering.

The Early Head Start Evaluation is one of two national studies that will collect data from fathers themselves. It focuses on father-child interactions in the context of an early intervention program at three time points, when children are 14, 24, and 36 months old. Both biological and social fathers will be asked questions about their background and current social situation, their conceptualization of fatherhood and their interaction with children; many will be observed directly engaging with their children. The study will provide valuable data on how men interact with their children, how they view themselves in their father role and how they perceive their social and emotional investment in their children's lives. To capture the earliest phases of this process and to explore how the father-child relationship may change over time, an embedded study of newborns and their fathers and mothers has been added to the EHS evaluation.

A second national study that will collect data from fathers will begin in the year 2000. It is the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Birth Cohort, which is designed to track a nationally representative sample of infants at 6-month intervals from birth to 2 years and yearly thereafter until the children reach at least first grade. The purpose of the study is to assess children's health and growth and development in domains that are critical for later school readiness and academic achievement. The study will address children's transitions to nonparental care and early education programs, kindergarten, and first grade. It will provide data on the relationship between children's early care and education experiences and their growth in key developmental domains.

The Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study brings together three areas of great interest to policymakers and researchers: nonmarital childbearing, welfare reform, and the role of fathers. The study will follow a cohort of unwed parents and their children. It will provide previously unavailable information on the conditions

and capabilities of new unwed fathers, on the relationship between unwed mothers and fathers, on the factors that push new unwed parents together or apart, on how public policies affect parents' behavior and living arrangements, and on the consequences of new welfare regulations for parents, children, and society.

Three major studies, collectively known as the Welfare Studies and currently underway, will provide longitudinal, ethnographic, and qualitative data on how welfare reform affects poor children and their families—that is, will it hurt them or harm them? These are Children, Families, and Welfare Reform: A Multi-City Study (Three City); Los Angeles Study of Families and Communities; and New Hope, a study of welfare in Milwaukee. An important component of these longitudinal studies is how families—fathers, mothers, and children—negotiate the new policies and how this new context influences the way they relate to one another.

In addition to these research initiatives, there is a national effort to address the "male undercount." Statistical agencies are now determined to include men in all national surveys and, in the interest of children, to improve the information base on fathers, from basic demographics to family process. The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 Cohort (1998), for example, plans to develop a set of questions on parenting for young men and women who will become parents in the next decade. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics (Hill, 1992) is asking the same questions of fathers as they do of mothers and has plans to expand data on nonresident fathers' involvement with their children. The Census Bureau and the National Center on Health Statistics (NCHS) are working on a couple of methodology projects to incorporate men. The National Survey of Family Growth (NCHS, 1998) has funding to add men to their next round of data collection. It will survey approximately 7,200 men by the year 2000. The National Survey of Family Households (1998) also has father-related questions.

Policy Directions

There are strong grounds for hope that public policy is ready to confront many of the issues raised here. The Fatherhood Initiative has brought about a shift in how federal agencies view fathers, collect data, and design policy. Policymakers have gone beyond viewing fathers narrowly as providers only, to recognizing them in their own right as vital contributors to their children's development.

This new perspective is reflected in the five principles that currently shape policies on fathers in the Department of Health and Human Services:

- All fathers can be important contributors to the well-being of their children.
- Parents are partners in raising their children, even when they do not live in the same household.
- The roles fathers play in families are diverse and related to cultural and community norms.
- Men should receive the education and support necessary to prepare them for the responsibility of parenthood.
- Government can encourage and promote father involvement through its programs and through its own workforce policies, especially for low-income fathers.

In addition to these national goals, most states have recently undertaken strategic initiatives, with welfare reform a major impetus, to promote responsible fatherhood and to increase public awareness of the importance of fathers' involvement in the lives of their children. They have convened statewide summits and conferences and sponsored statewide media campaigns to promote positive father involvement. These efforts have focused on all fathers, including fathers in two-parent families, teen fathers, noncustodial fathers (both divorced and never married), and single fathers. The National Governors' Association has published a list of the best state programs aimed at promoting responsible fathering. Thirty governors submitted descrip-

tions of the best fatherhood initiatives. These fall into six categories: services for low-income, noncustodial fathers; parenting skills training; public awareness campaigns; commissions; comprehensive funding streams; and, prevention of premature fatherhood.

Some policy analysts and researchers express concern that such initiatives rarely include evaluation, that they too often proceed without evidence on what works best for which fathers (Knitzer, Brenner, & Gadsden, 1997). Nevertheless, states have an excellent opportunity to innovate and lead in the promotion of responsible fatherhood. Government and philanthropic support has created a network of programs across the country that seek to raise the income of low-income men and strengthen their ties to their children. Nearly all states given substantial federal welfare-to-work grants this year have pledged to include fathers in their programs. Rigorous evaluation research is now needed to assess the effectiveness of these efforts.

Where Are We Going Next? Directions in Research and Policy

To date, most of the existing research on fathers, and in turn the policies that are relevant to fathers, have been based on small and select samples and on unitary measures of father involvement, sometimes assessed at a single point in time. What we know about fathers we have learned from small studies of middle-class men and from studies of mothers. Consequently the evidence on fathers is limited. We need research that directly addresses policy-related questions and provides data that can be used to design and implement programs. How can social policies and programs encourage father involvement, beyond child support, and best foster the father-child relationship?

A New Research Agenda

One goal of the current research agenda on father involvement should be to inform social policy and enhance services to fathers and families. To address these shortcomings, future research needs to:

(1) extend investigation to low-income fathers from ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds;
(2) elicit the perspectives of fathers themselves, rather than relying on data from mothers as proxies for fathers;
(3) consider the multidimensional nature of father involvement rather than a unitary measure, like "presence" or "absence";
(4) track the changing nature and influence of father involvement over time;
(5) commence in the prenatal or infancy period; and
(6) directly address social policy.

Fortunately, many of the research initiatives described above promise to address these gaps in current knowledge.

Extending research to low-income and ethnically diverse populations. Most of what we know about the father-child relationship comes from studies of middle-class families, a sample more of convenience than of import for families most targeted by social programs and public policy (Greene et al., 1996). What studies there are of minority or economically disadvantaged fathers have focused largely on negative aspects of behavior and negative outcomes. In addition, studies of men have generally excluded those who have unstable housing, do not live with their families, or are homeless. This "male undercount" calls into question the validity of the information we have about fathers. Research on diverse populations, on hard-to-reach fathers, and on potential strengths in less advantaged families is much needed.

Eliciting the father perspective. In much of the research mothers have served as proxies for fathers. Few studies have asked fathers to talk about their commitment to fatherhood, their

involvement with their children, or what services they consider needed. We need studies that investigate fathers directly, with samples that represent populations until now neglected.

Taking a multidimensional approach. As noted earlier, father involvement is best conceptualized as a multidimensional construct, rather than as merely father absence or presence. Researchers also need to consider relations between different types of involvement. Some studies, for example, indicate a strong relationship between father accessibility and responsibility (Arditti & Keith, 1993; Furstenberg, Nord, Peterson, & Zill, 1983; King, 1994; Seltzer, Schaeffer, & Charing, 1989; Sonenstein & Calhoun, 1990). Other studies of African American families have found an inverse relationship between accessibility and responsibility, with fathers appearing less involved and having less direct contact with their children because they are working hard to meet family needs (Boyden, 1993). Future studies and social policies should consider the specific influence of and relations among different types of father involvement and consider the ways to best support and encourage father involvement at many levels.

Adopting a developmental perspective. Longitudinal investigations of father-child interactions, with their antecedents and consequences, are rare. But particularly striking is the finding that low-income fathers (such as adolescent fathers and fathers of children raised on AFDC) are most involved with their children shortly after birth and much less so as their children grow older (Lerman, 1993; Perloff & Buckner, 1996). In the case of teen fathers, although two thirds are actively involved with their children some time after birth, this contact does not last long (Marsiglio, 1987). In one study almost half of new adolescent fathers visited their child every week, and nearly one quarter had daily contact; but by the time children were in school, less than one quarter of fathers saw them weekly (Lerman, 1993). In a longitudinal follow-up of a study in Baltimore, 80% of children received some child support at age 1, 33% at age 5, and only 17% by mid-adolescence (Furstenberg & Harris, 1993). Longitudinal studies are needed to identify factors that most affect changes to involvement over time.

Focusing on the early transition to fatherhood. Prospective studies that consider father involvement beginning in the prenatal and early infancy periods are also needed. Father involvement has its roots in the initial expectations and life circumstances surrounding fertility and birth. We know little about this period, or about its significance for father involvement over time.

Evidence suggests that periods of transition in development present critical points of evaluation, renewed self-definition, adjustment, and reconstruction , which can lead to changes in an individual's relationship with others (Ruble, 1994); the transition to fatherhood has rarely, if ever, been considered in this light. One stage model proposes three key periods of change and adaptation to major transitions (Ruble, 1994):

(1) a period of conflict and uncertainty early on, termed "onset";
(2) a period of adaptation and consolidation, "change"; and
(3) a period of stabilization over the longer time frame, "equilibrium."

This theoretical framework could be useful to understanding the transition to parenthood, which can be stressful for all parents. Of special interest is the adaptation of a father to his new role and whether and how his initial adjustment affects his long-term commitment to his child.

Integrating Research and Social Policy

Research and social policy have been only recently integrated in ways that might effectively meet the needs of children and fathers. It is urgent to understand the consequences of greater or lesser levels of father involvement for children's development and to identify effective programs and policies to promote positive father-child relationships.

In about five years, national data on father involvement from investigations such as EHS,

ECLS-B, and Fragile Families will be available. These national-level data will address many of the shortcomings of past research and should extend our knowledge about the antecedents and consequences of father involvement for children, especially those from underrepresented, low-income families. These data are being collected in the context of welfare reform and hence will have policy implications. Taken together, this new knowledge source will give us a better understanding of what it means to be a father under economic strain, which will be critical in developing and implementing policies for low-income fathers. Moreover, findings from these studies should be integrated into extant developmental theories as we revisit how changes to family structures and the roles of fathers affect children's lives.

Child support and paternity establishment policies. Some policy analysts have suggested that paternity establishment programs meant to support rather than hinder fathers' involvement should include education and job training, public outreach and education, and support and assistance for responsible parenting (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994; Danziger, Kastner, & Nickel, 1993). Similarly, researchers have proposed that child support programs need to recognize in-kind support and introduce flexible levels of support (Danziger et al., 1993; Sullivan, 1993). Broadening the definition of child support to include the provision of food and clothing, time spent with children, and child care might encourage fathers to connect more with their children and contribute to their long-term development.

Custody agreements. As custody laws become gender neutral, shared custody promises to become more common. Unless mothers and fathers deal with each other amicably, however, any arrangement is likely to fail and have negative consequences for children. Some researchers have proposed mediation as well as giving absent fathers more rights (Braver & O'Connell, 1998). Visitation rights, for example, could be tied to child support payment, which is currently not the case. Making visitation and custody rights more explicit and enforcing them might also help keep fathers involved.

Welfare reform. The consequences of welfare reform for men, women, and children are yet to be known. Work requirements may open employment opportunities for some women that will benefit their children, but for others these requirements may result in greater hardship and fewer resources. For some men the added stress to mothers who are already in distress may afford an opportunity to play an enlarged role in the well-being of the family. Men have come to represent an untapped resource for welfare families moving into the workforce. Yet other men who lack employment and other resources may become more alienated from their families.

Welfare reform programs are, in fact, showing little effect on fathers thus far. Moreover, we lack data on the intended promotion of marriage and the two-parent family. Evidence about the effect of AFDC benefits on family structure is mixed (see Moffit, 1992 for a review). This outcome, then, would have to be evaluated in the context of recent demographic trends—in marriage, divorce, fertility—and other contextual characteristics, such as family process, father absence (either psychological or physical), and type of father involvement in relationship to the child's stage of development. The question for policymakers and researchers is whether welfare laws will increase the rate of marriage, and if this happens, how stable those unions will be. How will children fare in these families?

Parental leave. As the cultural image of the father as child care provider becomes more acceptable, how might policies on paternal leave encourage a father's involvement in the care of his new infant? Some anecdotal evidence suggests that the private sector is beginning to make the work place more father-friendly and to implement policies that encourage men to be part of their children's lives without sacrificing their careers. A recent publication, for example, listing the 100 best companies for the worker, includes progressive employee policies for mothers and

fathers as a criterion. Courts are also beginning to tip the balance toward more favorable consideration of fathers. In a recent case in Virginia, a father was awarded damages for being fired from work when he took leave to care for his sick child.

Mothers' role as gatekeeper. Researchers, policymakers, and practitioners have to work together to identify the circumstances under which it is unsuitable to encourage a father's involvement or re-involvement in his child's life. Programs and policies also need to address father-mother conflict, in that research indicates that poor relationships are strong barriers to father involvement. When should a mother's role as gatekeeper be respected, and when is it inappropriate? How do we address the harsh realities of domestic violence and child abuse and best protect victims but still minimize false accusations?

Conclusions

Recent socio-historical trends, including changes in mothers' workforce participation and changing family structures, have placed fathers at the center of research efforts and policy debates. Today many fathers are more involved in their children's lives than their own fathers were, while others are increasingly distancing themselves from their children. Some children experience warm relationships with their fathers; others experience inconsistent, unstable support; others will be adversely affected by destructive fathering behavior; still others will lose their fathers early in their development. Some children will experience high levels of involvement from males other than their biological fathers, such as grandfathers and uncles. For boys and girls, these early experiences will no doubt influence, for better or worse, their social and cognitive adjustments throughout life as well as their expectations about their future roles as fathers and mothers. To what extent can researchers and policymakers work together to learn about and support these developmental processes?

Although we know that positive father involvement enhances developmental outcomes in children, there still exists a noteworthy gap between what we currently know about father involvement and what we still need to learn—particularly with respect to the effects of different dimensions of father involvement on specific abilities in children at specific developmental periods. We also know little about the process by which fathers and children, in the context of families, establish a positive relationship. Moreover, research on the nature, antecedents, and outcomes of father involvement, particularly in underrepresented, low-income and minority families remains limited. At present, researchers have only begun to examine some of these issues in large-scale national studies that will undoubtedly unearth a wealth of information about the nature, determinants, and consequences of father involvement.

Most notably, the integration of research and policy on fathers is yet in its infancy. Researchers should be encouraged to attend to constructs and variables that not only have theoretical relevance for policy and practice but can also be readily translated and incorporated into policy and program initiatives. Social trends are useful markers that help us gain a broad picture of the ecological context in which families live. Both researchers and policymakers need to be cognizant of the dynamic interplay between research and policy, and of how knowledge about father involvement and well-targeted policy initiatives together feed the process of support to all family members, most notably children. How best might social policies ensure that the next generation of fathers receives more support and recognition than in the past? What role do schools and other community institutions have in preparing boys for fatherhood, and girls in their expectations about the future fathers of their children? What role will society play in encouraging and promoting positive father-child relationships in the 21st century?

References

Achatz, M., & McAllum, C. A. (1994). *The Young Unwed Fathers Demonstration Project: A status report.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Allen, W. D., & Doherty, W. J. (1996). The responsibilities of fatherhood as perceived by African American teenage fathers. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 77,* 142–155.

Amato, P. R., & Rezac, S. J. (1994). Contact with non-resident parents, interparental conflict, and children's behavior. *Journal of Family Issues, 15,* 191–207.

Anderson, E. (1993). Sex codes and family life among poor inner-city youths. In R. I. Lerman & T. J. Ooms (Eds.), *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies* (pp. 74–98). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Anderson, J. B., & Stanley, L. (1976, September). A methodology for observation of the childbirth environment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Arditti, J. A., & Keith, T. Z. (1993). Visitation frequency, child support payment, and the father-child relationship post-divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55,* 699–712.

Argys, L. M., & Peters, H. E. (1996). *Can adequate child support be legislated? A theoretical model of responses to child support guidelines and enforcement efforts.* Mimeographed document, Department of Policy Analysis and Management, Cornell University.

Argys, L. M., Peters, H. E., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Smith, J. R. (1998). The impact of child support dollars on cognitive outcomes. *Demography, 35,* 159–173.

Averett, S. L., Gennetian, L. A., & Peters, E. H. (1997, October 10–11). *Paternal child care and children's cognitive development.* Paper presented at the Conference on Father Involvement, Fatherhood Initiative, Bethesda, MD.

Axinn, W. G., Barber, J. S., & Thornton, A. (1998). The long-term impact of parents' childbearing decisions on children's self-esteem. *Demography, 35,* 435–443.

Bell, R. Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. *Psychological Review, vol. 75,* 81–95.

Belsky, J. (1996). Parent, infant and social-contextual antecedents of father-son attachment security. *Developmental Psychology, 32,* 905–913.

Belsky, J. (1998). Paternal influence and children's well-being: Limits of and new directions for understanding. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Men in Families* (pp. 279–293). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum.

Blau, F., Ferber, M., & Winkler, A. (1998). *The economics of women, men, and work.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Boyden, J. (1993). *Family matters.* London: Gaia Books.

Braver, S. L., & O'Connell, D. (1998). *Divorced dads.* New York: Putnam.

Brayfield, A. (1995). Juggling jobs and kids: The impact of employment schedules on fathers' caring for children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57,* 321–332.

Brown, S. S., & Eisenberg, L. (Eds.). (1995). *The best intentions.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bumpass, L. L., Raley, R. K., & Sweet, J. A. (1995). The changing character of stepfamilies: Implications of cohabitation and nonmarital childbearing. *Demography, 32,* 425–436.

Bumpass, L. L., Sweet, J. A., & Castro-Martin, T. C. (1990). Changing patterns of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52,* 747–756.

Bureau of the Census. (1998). *Household and family characteristics:* March 1998 (Update). Report P20-515, tables PPL-101. Unpub-

lished tables. Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census Population Division.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1986). *Labor force participation rates of married women, husband present, by presence and age of own children, 1950–1984*. Unpublished tables. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1997). Marital and family characteristics of the labor force from the March 1997 *Current Population Survey*. Unpublished statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Cabrera, N., Tamis Le-Monda, C., Bradley, R., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M. (in press). Fatherhood in the 21st century. *Child Development*.

Cancian, M., & Meyer, D. (1998). Who gets custody? *Demography, 35*, 147–157.

Casper, L. M. (1997). *My daddy takes care of me! Fathers as care providers*. Current Population Reports, 70–59. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Casper, L. M., & O'Connell, M. (1998). Work, income, the economy, and married fathers as child care providers. *Demography, 35*, 243–250.

Coley, R. L., & Chase-Lansdale, P. L. (1998). Adolescent pregnancy and parenthood. *American Psychologist, 53*, 152–166.

Cowan, C., & Cowan, P. (1987). Men's involvement in parenthood: Identifying the antecedents and understanding the barriers. In P. Berman, P. Pedersen, & F. Pedersen (Eds.), *Men's transitions to parenthood: Longitudinal studies of early family experience* (pp. 145–174). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum.

Cox, M. J., Owen, M. T., Henderson, V. K., & Margand, N. A. (1992). Prediction of infant-father and infant-mother attachment. *Child Development, 28*, 474–483.

Cox, M. J., Owen, M. T., Lewis, J. M., & Henderson, V. K. (1989). Marriage, adult adjustment and early parenting. *Child Development, 60*, 1015–1024.

Danziger, S. K., Kastner, C. K., & Nickel, T. J. (1993). The problems and promise of child support policies. In R. I. Lerman & T. J. Ooms (Eds.), *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies* (pp. 235–250). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Darke, P. R., & Goldberg, S. (1994). Father-infant interaction and parent stress with healthy and medically compromised infants. *Infant Behavior and Development, 17*, 3–14.

DeLuccie, M. F. (1995). Mothers as gatekeepers: A model of maternal mediators of father involvement. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 156*, 115–131.

Doherty, W. J., Kouneski, E. F., & Erickson, M. F. (1998). Responsible fathering: An overview and conceptual framework. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 277–292.

Easterbrooks, M. A., & Goldberg, W. A. (1984). Toddler development in the family: Impact of father involvement and parenting characteristics. *Child Development, 53*, 740–752.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (1998a). *America's children: Key national indicators of well-being*. Author: Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (1998b). *Nurturing fatherhood: Improving data and research on male fertility, family formation, and fatherhood*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ferketich, S., & Mercer, R. (1995). Paternal-infant attachment of experienced and inexperienced fathers during infancy. *Nursing Research, 44*, 31–37.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (1987). The next extended family: The experience of parents and children after remarriage. In K. Pasley & M. Ihinger-Tallman (Eds.), *Remarriage and stepparenting: Current research and theory* (pp. 42–61). New York: Guilford.

Furstenberg, F. (1998, May 7–8). *The effects of welfare reform on the family: The good, the bad, and the ugly*. Paper presented at the Family Process and Child Development in Low Income Families Conference, Joint Center for Poverty Research, Chicago, IL.

Furstenberg, F., & Harris, K. (1993). When and why fathers matter: Impacts of father involvement on the children of adolescent mothers. In R. Lerman & T. Ooms (Eds.), *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies* (pp. 117–138). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., Morgan, S. P., & Allison, P. D. (1987). Paternal participation and children's well-being after marital dissolution. *American Sociological Review, 52*, 695–701.

Furstenberg, F. F., Nord, C. W., Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1983). The lifecourse of children of divorce: Marital disruption and parental contact. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 656–668.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., Sherwood, K. E., & Sullivan, M. L. (1992). *Caring and paying: What fathers and mothers say about child support*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Gable, S., Crnic, K., & Belsky, J. (1994). Coparenting within the family system: Influences on children's development. *Family Relations, 43*, 380–386.

Garfinkel, I., McLanahan, S. S., Meyer, D. R., & Seltzer, J. A. (1998). *Fathers under fire*. New York: Russell Sage.

Graham, J. W., Beller, A. H., & Hernandez, P. M. (1994). The determinants of child support income. In I. Garfinkel, S. S. McLanahan, & P. K. Robins (Eds.), *Child support and child well-being* (pp. 317–333). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Greene, A. D., Halle, T. G., Le Menestrel, S., & Moore, K. A. (1998). *Father involvement in young children's lives: Recommendations for a fatherhood module for the ECLS-B*. Paper prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics by Child Trends, Inc., Washington, DC.

Greene, A. D., Hearn, G., & Emig, C. (1996, June 11–12). *Developmental, ethnographic, and demographic perspectives on fatherhood: Summary of report of the conference*. Paper prepared for the NICHD Family and Child Well-Being Research Network by Child Trends, Bethesda, MD.

Greene, A. D., & Moore, K. A. (1996). *Nonresident father involvement and child outcomes among young children in families on welfare*. Washington, DC: Child Trends, Inc.

Harris, K., Furstenberg, F. F. Jr., & Marmer, J. K. (1998). Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families: The influence of fathers over the life course. *Demography, 35*, 201–216.

Henshaw, S. K. (1998). Unintended pregnancy in the United States. *Family Planning Perspectives, 30*, 24–29.

Hernandez, D. J. (1993). *America's children: Resources from family, government, and the economy*. New York: Russell Sage.

Hetherington, E. M., & Henderson, S. H. (1997). Fathers in stepfamilies. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd edit., pp. 212–226). New York: Wiley.

Hill, M. S. (1992). *The Panel Study of Income Dynamics: A users' guide*. London: Sage.

Hossain, Z., & Roopnarine, J. (1994). African-American fathers' involvement with infants: Relationship to their functioning style, support, education and income. *Infant Behavior and Development, 17*, 175–184.

Hyde, J. S., Essex, M. J., & Horton, F. (1993). Fathers and parental leave: Attitudes and experiences. *Journal of Family Issues, 14*, 616–641.

Ihinger-Tallman, M., Pasley, K., & Buehler, C. (1995). Developing a middle-range theory of father involvement postdivorce. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research, and social policy* (pp. 57–77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jain, A., Belsky, J., & Crnic, K. (1996). Beyond fathering behaviors: Types of dads. *Journal of Family Psychology, 10*, 431–442.

Jarvis, P. A. & Creasy, B. L. (1991). Parental stress, coping, and attachment in families with an 18-month-old infant. *Infant Behavior and Development, 14*, 383–395.

King, V. (1994). Variation in the consequences of nonresident father involvement for children's well-being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 963–972.

Klerman, J. A., & Liebowitz, A. (1997). Labor supply effects of state maternity leave legislation. In F. D. Blau & R. G. Ehrenberg (Eds.), *Gender and family issues in the workplace* (pp. 65–85). New York: Russell Sage.

Knitzer, J., Brenner, E., & Gadsden, V. (1997). *Map and track: State initiatives to encourage responsible fatherhood*. New York: National Center for Children in Poverty.

Knox, V. W. (1996). The effects of child support payments on developmental outcomes for elementary school-age children. *Journal of Human Resources, 31*, 816–840.

Knox, V. W., & Bane, M. J. (1994). Child support and schooling. In I. Garfinkel, S. S. McLanahan, & P. K. Robbins (Eds.), *Child support and child well-being* (pp. 285–310). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Lamb, M. (1997). *The role of the father in child development*. New York: Wiley.

Lamb, M. E., Pleck, J., Charnov, E. L., & Levine, J. A. (1987). A biosocial perspective on paternal behavior and involvement. In J. B. Lancaster, J. Altman, A. Rossi, & L. R. Sherrod (Eds.), *Parenting across the life span: Biosocial perspective* (pp. 111–142). New York: Aldine de Bruyter.

Lerman, R. (1993). A national profile of young unwed fathers. In R. Lerman, R. Ooms, & T. Ooms (Eds.), *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies* (pp. 27–51). Philadelphia: Temple University.

Levine, J. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (1997). *Working Fathers: New strategies for balancing work and family*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

MacDonald, K. B., & Parke, R. D. (1984). Bridging the gap: Parent-child play interactions and peer competence. *Child Development, 55*, 1265–1277.

Mahoney, M. M. (1994). Reformulating the legal definition of the stepparent-child relationship. In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.), *Stepfamilies: Who benefits? Who does not?* (pp. 191–196). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum.

Marsiglio, W. (1987). Adolescent fathers in the United States: Their initial living arrangements, marital experience and educational outcomes. *Family Planning Perspectives, 19*, 240–251.

Marsiglio, W., Day, R., Braver, S., Evans, J., Lamb, M., & Peters, E. (1998). Report of the working group on conceptualizing male parenting. In Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, *Nurturing fatherhood: Improving data and research on male fertility, family formation, and fatherhood* (pp. 101–174). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Martin, T. C., & Bumpass, L. (1989). Recent trends in marital disruption. *Demography, 26*, 37–51.

McKenry, P. C., McKelvey, M. W., Leigh, D., & Wark, L. (1996). Nonresidential father involvement: A comparison of divorced, separated, never married, and remarried fathers. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 25*(3-4), 1–13.

McLanahan, S. S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

McLanahan, S. S., Seltzer, J. A., Hanson, T. L., & Thomas, E. (1994). Child support enforcement and child well-being: Greater security or greater conflicts. In I. Garfinkel, S. S. McLanahan, & P. K. Robins (Eds.), *Child support and child well-being* (pp. 239–254). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Moffit, R. (1992). Incentive effects of the U.S. welfare system. *Journal of Economic Literature 30*, 1–61.

The National Center on Health Statistics. (1998). *The National Survey of Family Growth*. Hyattsville, MD: Author, Family Growth Survey Staff, Division of Vital Statistics.

Noppe, I. C., Noppe, L. D., & Hughes, F. P. (1991). Stress as a predictor of the quality of parent-infant interactions. *Journal of Genetic*

Psychology, 152, 17–28.

Nord, C. (1997). *Fathers' involvement in their children's schools.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Nord, C. W., & Zill, N. (1996). *Non-custodial parents' participation in their children's lives: Evidence from the survey of income and program participation* (2 Vols.), final report prepared for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

O'Connell, M. (1993). Where's papa? Father's role in child care. In *Population Trends and Public Policy* No. 20. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.

Parke, R. D. (1996). *Fatherhood.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Parke, R. D., & Brott, A. A. (1999). *Throwaway dads: The myths and barriers that keep men from being the fathers they want to be.* New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Parke, R. D., & O'Leary, S. E. (1976). Family interaction in the newborn period: Some findings, some observations and some unresolved issues. In K. Riegel & J. Meacham (Eds.), *The developing individual in a changing world: Vol. 2, Social and environmental issues* (pp. 653–663). The Hague: Mouton.

Perloff, J., & Buckner, J. (1996). Fathers of children on welfare: Their impact on child well-being. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 66,* 557–571.

Peters, E., & Mullis, N. (1997). The role of family income and sources of income in adolescent achievement. In G. J. Duncan & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Consequences of growing up poor* (pp. 340–382). New York: Russell Sage.

Pleck, E. H. (1983). Husbands' paid work and family roles: Current research issues. In H. Lopata & J. Pleck (Eds.), *Research in the interweave of social roles: Families and jobs* (Vol. 3, pp. 231–333). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Pleck, E. H. (1997). Paternal involvement: Levels, sources, and consequences. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd edit., pp. 66–103). New York: Wiley.

Pleck, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1997). Fatherhood ideals in the United States: Historical dimensions. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (3rd edit., pp. 33–48). New York: Wiley.

Presser, H. (1994). Employment schedules among dual-earner spouses and the division of household labor by gender. *American Sociological Review, 59,* 348–364.

Presser, H. (1995). Job, family, and gender: Determinants of non-standard work schedules among employed Americans in 1991. *Demography, 32,* 577–598.

Pruett, K. (1987). *The nurturing father.* New York: Warner Books.

Radin, N. (1982). Primary-caregiving and role-sharing fathers. In M. Lamb (Ed.), *Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development* (pp. 173–204). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum.

Ramsey, S. H. (1994). Stepparents and the law: A nebulous status and need for reform. In K. Pasley & M. Ihinger-Tallman (Eds.), *Stepparenting: Issues in theory, research and practice* (pp. 217–237). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Rangaranjan, A., & Gleason, P. (1998). Young unwed fathers of AFDC children: Do they provide support? *Demography, 35,* 175–186.

Ruble, D. (1994). A phase model of transitions: Cognitive and motivational consequences. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 26,* 163–214.

Seltzer, J. A. (1994). Intergenerational ties in adulthood and childhood experience. In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.), *Stepfamilies: Who benefits? Who does not?* (pp. 89–96). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum.

Seltzer, J. A. (1998). Father by law: Effects of joint legal custody on nonresident fathers' involvement with children. *Demography, 35,* 135–146.

Seltzer, J. A., Schaeffer, N. C., & Charing, H. W. (1989). Family ties after divorce: The rela-

tionship between visiting and paying child support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*, 1013–1032.

Sonenstein, F. L., & Calhoun, C. A. (1990). Determinants of child support: A pilot study of absent parents. *Contemporary Policy Issues, 8*, 75–94.

Sullivan, L. W. (1992, January 9). Paper presented to the Institute of American Values Council on Families in America, New York.

Sullivan, M. L. (1993). Young fathers and parenting in two inner-city neighborhoods. In R. I. Lerman & T. J. Ooms (Eds.), *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies* (pp. 52–73). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Volling, B. L., & Belsky, J. (1992). Infant, father, and marital antecedents of infant-father attachment security in dual-earner and single-earner families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 15*, 83–100.

Wattenberg, E. (1993). Paternity actions and young fathers. In R. I. Lerman & T. J. Ooms (Eds.), *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies* (pp. 213–234). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Weiss, Y., & Willis, R. J. (1985). Children as collective goods in divorce settlements. *Journal of Labor Economics, 3*, 268–292.

Wilkie, J. R. (1993). Changes in U.S. men's attitudes toward the family provider role, 1972–1989. *Gender and Society, 7*, 261–279.

Williams, E., Radin, N., & Coggins, K. (1996). Parental involvement in childrearing and the school performance of Ojibwa children: An exploratory study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 42*, 578–595.

Working Group on Conceptualizing Male Parenting. (1997). *Social fatherhood and paternal involvement: Conceptual, data, and policymaking issues*. Paper presented at the NICHD Conference on Fathering and Male Fertility: Improving Data and Research, Bethesda, MD.

Yogman, M. W., Kindlon, D., & Earls, F. (1995). Father involvement and cognitive/behavioral outcomes of preterm infants. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 343*, 58–66.

Zill, N., Morrison, D. R., & Coiro, M. J. (1993). Long-term effects of parental divorce on parent-child relationships, adjustment, and achievement in young adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 7*, 91–103.

About the Authors

Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda, associate professor, is director of the Ph.D. program in Psychological Development in the Department of Applied Psychology, School of Education, at New York University. As a member of the Early Head Start Fathers' Studies Research group, she is currently investigating various dimensions of father and mother involvement in relation to children's cognitive and social development across the first three years of life. She is co-editor with Natasha Cabrera of a forthcoming book entitled *Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*.

Natasha J. Cabrera is an Expert in Child Development at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Center for Population Research. She is the coordinator of the Science and Ecology of Early Development Program, co-facilitator of the Family and Child Well-Being Research Network, and coordinator of the fatherhood research and welfare studies. She is program officer for the Early Head Start Fathers' Studies Research, which is embedded in the National Evaluation of Head Start. She works on the areas of fatherhood, child care, the normative development of low-income children, and the interface between policy and research.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost we wish to thank Nancy Thomas for her invaluable support and feedback through the process of writing and revising this report—the final version of this paper very much reflects her thoughtfulness, keen editorial eye, wisdom, and careful comments. In addition, we thank an anonymous reviewer whose insight helped shape the final version of this report. We also wish to acknowledge our colleagues in the Early Head Start (EHS) Father Studies Work Group, who are our partners in the commitment to better understand the roles of fathers in young children's lives. The EHS Father Studies Work Group members represent the national Early Head Start evaluation contractor (Mathematica Policy Research and Columbia University); the funding agencies (Administration on Children, Youth and Families, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation in DHHS, and the Ford Foundation); the local research universities participating in the Early Head Start Research Consortium; and program directors from the Early Head Start programs participating in the national evaluation. Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda also wishes to acknowledge Jacqueline Shannon, who has been the backbone to the ongoing father research projects at New York University. Natasha Cabrera wishes to thank Sandy Hofferth, Jeff Evans, Marty Zaslow, and Jeff Ross for their help and support.

COMMENTARY

Drawing the Face of Contemporary Fatherhood

Ross A. Thompson

The publication of this thought-provoking essay by Tamis-LeMonda and Cabrera is timely. Fatherhood has always been a central concern of developmental scientists, but never has it been such a controversial topic of public and policy debate. Images of the "deadbeat dad," the involved father, and the absent parent are familiar cultural symbols of the different meanings of fatherhood to the contemporary family. Family scholars, policymakers, and commentators with very different views of family life and children's needs debate the meaning and significance of fatherhood to society. These debates are important to developmental scientists who study fathers because they frame the context in which research findings are interpreted, disseminated, and applied by those who shape family policy.

On one side of the "national family wars" (Popenoe, 1993) are scholars like Blankenhorn (1995) and Popenoe (1996), who urge a reinvigoration of traditional fatherhood as the answer to the progressive "deinstitutionalization of marriage" and decline of the two-parent family in recent decades (see also Whitehead, 1997). They argue that a paternal recommitment to marriage and childrearing would benefit children socially and economically by reducing the escalation of nonmarital childbearing, curbing divorce, and keeping fathers involved with their children when divorce occurs. A reinvigorated fatherhood would also benefit men, they argue, because a commitment to their partners and offspring reduces the propensity for dangerous and deviant behavior in early adulthood and encourages instead fidelity to nurturance and care.

On the other side are scholars like Coontz (1997) and Stacey (1996) who seek instead cultural acceptance of diverse family forms which may or may not include fathers, but which support children's well-being. Recently, for example, Silverstein and Auerbach (1999) have argued that neither fathers nor marriage are central to healthy child development and advocate public policies that support father-child relationships independent of the marital relationship. Other scholars (e.g., Carbone, 1994; Fineman, 1991), concerned about the "feminization of poverty" that has accompanied rising divorce rates and nonmarital childbearing, underscore the importance of policies that ensure fathers' economic support of offspring and their primary caregivers (typically mothers), such as through more rigorous child support enforcement.

Both sides of the debate portray "father involvement" in the context of very different images of the family conditions that support children. It is not surprising that such heated debate centers on the meaning and significance of contemporary fatherhood. As noted by Tamis-LeMonda and Cabrera, significant changes in society have altered fathering roles and responsibilities, including the growth of dual-earner families, the increase of nonmarital childbearing and childrearing, changes in the social construction of gender roles, high rates of divorce and remarriage, a shift to a postindustrial service economy, broadened reproductive decisionmaking, and changes in social values concerning the family. Each has altered traditional ways of viewing the connection between fatherhood and marriage, economic provision, and child-rearing responsibility.

Moreover, fathers themselves have contributed to contemporary debate about the meaning of fatherhood to the family. Although many men enthusiastically embrace the ideal of the committed father, many men remain derelict in their responsibilities to offspring. Even though fidelity to visitation has increased meaningfully in recent years (Kelly, 1994; Thompson & Laible, 1999), too many children lose contact with their nonresidential fathers in the years following divorce. Even though the economic support of children has improved with new child support enforcement procedures, many children remain in need and many fathers do not pay what they are capable of providing (Meyer, 1999). The tension between contemporary cultural images of the involved, nurturant father ("good dads") and the absent, deadbeat dad ("bad dads") reflects how contemporary fatherhood has become less socially defined, more individually crafted, and more optional than for past generations of men (Furstenberg, 1988).

Research, Values, and Policy on Fatherhood

Fatherhood is, in short, a research concern with significant public and policy implications. Beliefs about the importance of father involvement reflect broader values about the nature of the family and the needs of children. These public and policy concerns provide a context for Tamis-Lemonda and Cabrera's discussion of father involvement, and add weight to many of their recommendations for research and policy. Their discussion suggests, in particular, three lessons for developmental scientists about the interaction between research, values, and policy concerning fatherhood and the family (Thompson & Wyatt, 1999).

First, research on fatherhood can contribute to a better awareness of the diverse dimensions of contemporary fatherhood than are typically appreciated in public discourse about "good dads" and "bad dads." This is one of the most important contributions of this article as the authors convincingly underscore how contemporary fatherhood is shaped by economic trends, marital relations, personal history, social values, public policies, and many other influences. The importance of moving beyond simple, stereotypical portrayals of fathers is also reflected in some of the authors' recommendations for future research, which include focusing on how fathers themselves perceive and experience fatherhood, and exploring the multidimensional nature of father involvement beyond their mere presence or absence in a child's life. In advancing these research perspectives, developmental scientists not only contribute to a better understanding of fatherhood but can also reframe public discourse about father involvement.

Nonresident fathers have been a cause of concern, for example, because their visits with offspring typically decline in frequency over time but, equally important, because visitation frequency seems to have little relation to measures of child well-being. When the *quality* of nonresident father involvement is considered, however, a different picture emerges (see Thompson & Amato, 1999). In a recent meta-analysis of research on nonresident fathers, Amato and Gilbreth (1999) found that two dimensions of postdivorce fatherhood were significantly predictive of children's well-being: "authoritative parenting" (reflected in activities such as noncoercive discipline, listening to children's problems, and giving advice) and "feelings of closeness" (indexing the affection and mutual respect between fathers and their children). Authoritative parenting was, in fact, a more significant predictor of children's well-being than was the economic support provided by fathers, and this suggests the value of public policies designed to ensure that nonresidential fathers and children can maintain the kinds of shared activities that are typical of parent-child relationships in intact families (Thompson, 1994). Studies indicating that fathers who fail in their economic support obligations are often willing but financially incapable of paying required

child support (see Meyer, 1999) also reflect the importance of attending to Tamis-LeMonda and Cabrera's research recommendations to study fatherhood as a multidimensional phenomenon, to understand the perspectives of fathers themselves, and to attend to the experience of low-income fathers. These studies also show how research on fatherhood sometimes challenges contemporary portrayals of the absent or "deadbeat" dad and offer new approaches to policies to enhance father involvement.

Second, research on fatherhood can also contribute to more thoughtful policy recommendations by highlighting the complexity of family life. Family law is a very blunt instrument for altering family functioning, and often policy reforms intended to address specific problems in family life have unintended detriments. Sometimes one member of a family benefits (e.g., mothers, fathers) while others do not (e.g., children), or sometimes family processes change beneficially but have unexpected consequences. Many of the current research initiatives on fatherhood profiled by Tamis-LeMonda and Cabrera were designed to elucidate these intended and unintended consequences of family policy, especially those concerned with the impact of reforms in welfare, paternity establishment, parental leave, and child support enforcement on father involvement, particularly in disadvantaged families. Understanding how policy reform related to fathers can have diverse consequences for families—both intended and unintended—is an important contribution of developmental researchers to policy debates about fatherhood.

On occasion, research can also consider the *potential* impact of proposed policy reforms. As the authors indicate, for example, much recent legislation has focused on enforcing fathers' economic support obligations to children without seeking to strengthen their visitation relationship. Financial support is the most regulatable form of father involvement, of course, and has the added benefit to policymakers of reducing public assistance to single mothers. But such policies emphasize the economic support of fatherhood over its relational significance and are vulnerable to charges of unfairness. What would happen, therefore, if visitation was explicitly tied to child support payments? Would fathers maintain greater fidelity to visitation because of their economic commitment to offspring (Seltzer, McLanahan, & Hanson, 1998)? Would they become "born again dads" who are motivated to visit offspring primarily because it reduces their child support obligation (Maccoby, 1999)? What difference would the father's motivation make to children? How would mothers and fathers renegotiate their respective caregiving and economic responsibilities? These are researchable questions, especially in light of recent changes in divorce law in California that link child support payments more directly to the frequency of visitation of the nonresidential parent. Such research would underscore that changes in family policy should be considered in light of their diverse effects on family functioning.

Third, research on fatherhood can contribute to more thoughtful public and policy discourse about the family by emphasizing, as the authors do, fatherhood as a *developmental* phenomenon. This is important because, by contrast with the public tendency to perceive fatherhood exclusively as a *status*, a developmental orientation opens many potential avenues for strengthening fatherhood and father involvement.

As Tamis-LeMonda and Cabrera note, the origins of fatherhood begin in a boy's experience with his own father long before biological paternity occurs. It is shaped by the expectations of fatherhood fostered by the culture and it unfolds in the relationship with the child's mother before either have become parents. Fatherhood is forged in a young man's initial experiences with his offspring and the challenges and supports he experiences during this crucial transition. But there are further transitions in fatherhood. One occurs during the initial year or two after divorce or nonmarital childbearing, when enduring patterns of visi-

tation and economic child support become established (Thompson & Laible, 1999). Another is during the initial years after remarriage, when relationships with stepchildren are carefully and mutually negotiated.

If fatherhood is a developmental phenomenon, then there are many more opportunities to shape contemporary fatherhood than current public policies envision. These include consideration of the conflicting messages that boys and young men receive from society about the meaning and significance of fatherhood, the supports that expectant fathers receive when biological paternity occurs, and the lessons about nonresidential paternity or stepparenting that emerge explicitly (or implicitly) as men enter into divorce, remarriage, or other new family circumstances (Parke & Brott, 1999; Pollack, 1998). Because the law expresses as well as institutionalizes social values, public policies concerning parental leave, divorce, child custody and child support, welfare, and other aspects of family functioning enunciate portrayals of fatherhood with lifelong significance.

Conclusion

Fatherhood is a controversial topic of public and policy debate because it matters. Fathers profoundly influence the lives of offspring whether they are involved, nurturant dads or absent, disinterested parents. Moreover, the involvement of fathers in their families has broader implications for the lives of women, the nature of intergenerational relationships, and the demands on public assistance. This is why discourse about contemporary fatherhood inevitably embraces broader public values concerning the family and the needs of children.

Developmental scientists are influenced by the same social values, but their most important contribution to this debate is their resistance to oversimplified portrayals of fathers and the family. Their research teaches them that fathers and families are complex, and thus neither a society-wide rejuvenation of traditional fatherhood nor the relegation of fathers to economic providers alone is a satisfactory response to the dilemmas of contemporary fatherhood. Contributing to informed public discussion of these issues requires, however, that developmental scientists incorporate into their professional responsibility an awareness of and involvement in these policy discussions. As Tamis-LeMonda and Cabrera have shown, the connection between research and policy on father involvement is important to us all.

References

Amato, P. R., & Gilbreth, J. (1999). Nonresident fathers and children's well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61*, 557–573.

Blankenhorn, D. (1995). *Fatherless America*. New York: Basic.

Carbone, J. (1994). A feminist perspective on divorce. *The Future of Children, 4*, 183-209.

Coontz, S. (1997). *The way we really are: Coming to terms with America's changing families*. New York: Basic.

Fineman, M. A. (1991). *The illusion of equality: Rhetoric and the reality of divorce reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Furstenbe_, F. F., Jr. (1988). Good dads—bad dads: Two faces of fatherhood. In A. J. Cherlin (Ed.), *The changing American family and public policy* (pp. 193-218). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Kelly, J. B. (1994). The determination of child custody. *The Future of Children, 4*, 121-142.

Maccoby, E. E. (1999). The custody of children of divorcing families: Weighing the alternatives. In R. A. Thompson & P. R. Amato

(Eds.), *The postdivorce family: Children, parenting, and society* (pp. 51-70). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, D. R. (1999). Compliance with child support orders in paternity and divorce cases. In R. A. Thompson & P. R. Amato (Eds.), *The postdivorce family: Children, parenting, and society* (pp. 127-157). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parke, R. D., & Brott, A. (1999). *Throwaway dads*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Pollack, W. (1998). *Real boys*. New York: Random House.

Popenoe, D. (1993). The national family wars. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55*, 553-555.

Popenoe, D. (1996). *Life without father*. New York: Free Press.

Seltzer, J. A., McLanahan, S., & Hanson, T. L. (1998). Will child support enforcement increase father-child contact and parental conflict after separation? In I. Garfinkel, S. McLanahan, S. Seltzer, & D. R. Meyer (Eds.), *Fathers under fire*, pp. 157–190. New York: Russell Sage.

Silverstein, L. B., & Auerbach, C. F. (1999). Deconstructing the essential father. *American Psychologist, 54*, 397-407.

Stacey, J. (1996). *In the name of the family: Rethinking family values in the postmodern age*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Thompson, R. A. (1994). Fathers and divorce. *The Future of Children, 4*, 210-235.

Thompson, R. A., & Amato, P. R. (Eds.). (1999). *The postdivorce family: Children, parenting, and society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thompson, R. A., & Laible, D. J. (1999). Noncustodial parents. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), *Parenting and child development in "nontraditional" families* (pp. 103-123). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Thompson, R. A., & Wyatt, J. (1999). Values, policy, and research on divorce: Seeking fairness for children. In R. A. Thompson & P. R. Amato (Eds.), *The postdivorce family: Children, parenting, and society* (pp. 191-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Whitehead, B. D. (1997). *The divorce culture*. New York: Knopf.

About the Author

Ross A. Thompson is professor of psychology at the University of Nebraska, where he is also a core faculty member of the law-psychology program. His research interests focus on early sociopersonality development, including child-parent attachment, emotional development and understanding, and the growth of conscience. He also works on the applications of developmental science to problems in child and family policy, including child maltreatment, divorce and custody, grandparents' rights, and research ethics.

Social Policy Report *is a quarterly publication of the Society for Research in Child Development. The* Report *provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for the policies affecting children. Copyright of the articles published in the* Report *is maintained by SRCD. Statements appearing in the* Report *are the views of the author and do not imply endorsement by the Editor or by SRCD.*

Editor: Nancy G. Thomas
phone: (970) 925-5516 · fax: (970) 544-0662
New e-mail: ngthomas@sopris.net

Subscriptions available at $15.00 to nonmembers of SRCD, single issues at $4.80, and multiple copies at reduced rates. Write or phone:

SRCD Executive Office • University of Michigan • 505 East Huron, Suite 301 • Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522
(734) 998-6578

SRCD Executive Office
University of Michigan
505 East Huron, Suite 301
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522

SOCIAL POLICY REPORT
Society for Research in Child Development

Volume XIII, Number 3 1999

Evaluating the Effectiveness of School-Based Violence Prevention: Developmental Approaches

Christopher C. Henrich, Joshua L. Brown, and J. Lawrence Aber

Child and youth violence has been decreasing since the early 1990s, but despite significant decline, the prevalence of violent behaviors is still alarmingly high. A survey of a nationally representative sample of high school students found over 36% of respondents had been in a physical fight in the past year, 26% reported carrying weapons in the past 30 days, and nearly 10% reported carrying weapons at school in the past 30 days (Brener, Simon, Krug, & Lowry, 1999). Such findings highlight the need for continued violence prevention efforts designed expressly for children and adolescents. School-based programs fill a critical role in the broader prevention effort. Because children spend extensive time in school, interactions with teachers and classmates can exert a strong influence on social development (e.g., Consortium on the School-Based Promotion of Social Competence, 1994; Weissberg & Greenberg, 1998). This report synthesizes results from three evaluations of innovative school-based programs and discusses implications for further program implementation, evaluation research, and social policy.

A number of school-based programs aim indirectly to prevent violence and other problem behaviors by promoting social competence. Evaluations indicate that these programs can be effective, at least in the short term (e.g., Bruene-Butler, Hampson, Elias, Clabby, & Schuyler, 1997; Caplan et al., 1992; Hawkins, Von Cleve, & Catalano, 1991; Shure, 1997; Weissberg, Barton, & Schriver, 1997; Weissberg et al., 1981). A recent meta-analysis of 177 predomi-

Contents

Program Descriptions
Providing Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) . . . 3
Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO) . . 5
Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) . . . 5
Program Evaluations
PATHS . . . 6
FHAO . . . 7
RCCP . . . 9
Implications for research . . . 10
Implications for policy . . . 12
Brief
U.S. Department of Justice Initiatives . . 18

©1999 Society for Research in Child Development. All rights reserved.

nantly school-based primary prevention programs designed to reduce behavior problems and promote the social competency of children and adolescents demonstrates the promise of this type of prevention. A variety of interventions were included in the analysis: some focused on individual-centered change, a few on environment-centered change. They targeted a wide range of ages, from toddlers to adolescents. Overall, the meta-analysis identified modest program effects—reduced problem behaviors (externalizing and internalizing) and enhanced social competencies (Durlak & Wells, 1997).

Although this analysis showed that school-based interventions can work, it also highlights weaknesses in the current design and evaluation of prevention programs (Durlak & Wells, 1997; Weissberg & Bell, 1997). The majority of the interventions reviewed lacked articulated goals and provided only broad, nonspecific descriptions of procedures. Only one quarter of the evaluations collected follow-up data. Nearly half omitted information on participants' ethnicity and socioeconomic status, which are acknowledged factors in determining effectiveness in subpopulations. The evaluations also lacked sufficient information about implementation fidelity (quality) or dosage (quantity). Furthermore, the vast majority described person-centered interventions; only 10 of the 177 interventions were classified as environment-centered.

This meta-analysis thus raises important questions about which factors contribute most to the effectiveness of school-based prevention programs. To address these questions, we have synthesized the conclusions of various researchers to recommend the following principles for program designers and evaluators to consider and incorporate into the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs (e.g., Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999; Consortium on the School-Based Promotion of Social Competence, 1994; Dryfoos, 1990; Weissberg, Caplan, & Harwood, 1991; Weissberg & Greenberg, 1998):

Program Design and Implementation

- *Theoretical basis.* Even programs aimed at changing specific behaviors, such as aggression and violence, should evolve from a theoretical perspective on development—of the behavior and its related cognitions and emotions—and implement specific strategies to alter the child's developmental trajectory. Such a theoretical perspective should inform the evaluator's choice of outcome measures as well.
- *Multiple-components.* Programs should consist of multiple components that facilitate both person-centered and environmental change. To this end, programs should involve peers, parents, teachers, and administrators in addition to the children targeted for intervention, and evaluations should examine the impact of various components, if possible.
- *Extended duration of program implementation.* Programs of short duration tend to have only short-term effects (e.g., Consortium on the School-Based Promotion of Social Competence, 1994). Thus, interventions should span multiple years, and evaluations should assess cumulative and long-term effects.

Program Evaluation

- *Fidelity (quality) and dosage (quantity) of implementation.* To evaluate program effectiveness, it is vitally important to examine potential variation in both the fidelity of program implementation (i.e., how thoroughly and consistently a program is carried out) and the dosage of implementation (e.g., teacher time in training, number of activities, etc.).
- *Evaluation methodology.* Two different methodological approaches to program evaluation should be employed (Weissberg & Greenberg, 1998). One emphasizes traditional experimental methods, the other quasi-experimental methods. In the first, participants are randomly assigned to intervention and control groups. This approach tends to maximize internal validity because the ex-

perimental design permits one to clearly attribute change to the intervention; but it also tends to compromise generalizability because the program as implemented experimentally is rarely the same as the program implemented non-experimentally in the real world. In contrast, the second approach, the quasi-experimental, emphasizes the ecological context of an intervention and requires collaboration with program staff in formulating design and evaluation. This method tends to optimize generalizability because programs are evaluated as they are being implemented at scale; but it also compromises internal validity because program effects cannot be as clearly isolated. Each approach has its strengths and weaknesses, and which one is applied depends on a variety of factors (e.g., feasibility, state of knowledge from other studies, etc.). Researchers' choice of methodological approach is ultimately determined by discussions and negotiations with program designers and implementers. Rigorous evaluations should capitalize on both approaches, wherever possible.

This report emerged from a paper symposium held at the 1999 biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development in Albuquerque (Aber, Brown, Jones, & Mathew, 1999; Greenberg & Kusche, 1999; Schultz, Selman, Barr, & Daiute, 1999). The three evaluations described here were chosen for their rigor and their distinct yet complementary methodologies and results. All are derived from a developmental theoretical orientation and all involve a curriculum implemented by classroom teachers who receive training and ongoing support from program staff. Each addresses most of the recommendations listed above. We focus in depth on what can be learned from these examples about the factors that most contribute to program effectiveness.

In this report we (1) provide a description of each program; (2) discuss the evaluation design and results to date for each program; (3) synthesize the evaluation results and examine how they inform issues of implementation and evaluation; (4) discuss how these three evaluations collectively demonstrate the effectiveness of school-based violence prevention; and (5) address the policy challenges faced by program designers and evaluators in promoting school-based prevention as a component of state and community efforts to address the problem of youth violence.

Program Descriptions

In this section we describe each prevention program, with its theoretical framework, goals, and components (see Table 1, next page).

Providing Alternative THinking Strategies (PATHS)

PATHS is a social and emotional learning curriculum designed for elementary school-aged children (Greenberg & Kusche, 1998; Kusche & Greenberg, 1994). The PATHS curriculum is based on the "ABCD" (affective-behavioral-cognitive-dynamic) developmental model, which holds that children's adjustment and behavior are determined by an integration of emotional and cognitive development (Greenberg, Kusche, Cook, & Quamma, 1995). An underlying premise is that emotional development is a critical precursor of many cognitive functions, and thus children's thoughts and actions are influenced by their emotional awareness. Thus, to ensure children's optimal development, intellectual growth must be accompanied by the development of emotional competencies, such as the ability to understand the emotions of others and to utilize constructive strategies in the expression of one's own emotions.

The goals of PATHS are to (a) enhance children's social competence and social understanding and (b) to facilitate classroom learning of all types. The PATHS curriculum consists of approximately 50 lessons divided into three units: Self-control, Emotions and Relationships, and Social Problem-solving. In the Self-control unit, students learn self-control through an adaptation of the Turtle Technique (Schneider & Robin, 1978), which consists of a series of struc-

Table 1 Comparison of Evaluation Designs

	PATHS	FHAO	RCCP
Evaluation design	Experimental	Quasi-experimental	Quasi-experimental
Sample size	286; 6,715	409	5,053
Age of children	1st grade; 2nd–3rd grade	8th grade	2nd grade–6th grade
Location	Seattle; Multisite	Boston	New York City
Program components evaluated	Curriculum	Curriculum	Curriculum & teacher training
Assessment of dosage and/or fidelity?	Yes	No	Yes
Level of analysis	Individual & classroom	Individual	Individual
Theoretical model of development	ABCD model (p. 3)	GSID relationship model (p. 7)	Social information processing theory; developmental-structural theory (p. 9)
Theoretically targeted outcomes	• Emotional recognition & understanding • Strategies for emotional expression • Externalizing problems • Internalizing problems	• Relationship maturity (including perspective coordination) • Moral reasoning • Intergroup understanding (e.g. racist attitudes) • Civic participation • Fighting	• Hostile attributions • Aggressive fantasies • Interpersonal negotiation strategies • Aggressive & prosocial behaviors
Additional outcomes	—	—	Academic achievement
Theoretical predictions supported by outcomes?	Yes	In part	Yes

tured lessons accompanied by a reinforcement program that is individually tailored by teachers. Through a series of lessons, children are told an allegorical story about a young turtle who learns to develop better self-control. The Emotions and Relationships unit focuses on discussion of numerous topics, including approximately 45 different feeling states, the distinction between feelings and behaviors, cues in the self and others to recognizing feeling states, and how feelings can be changed and hidden. This unit also gives instruction in techniques for self-monitoring affect, issues in managing feelings, and understanding how one's behavior affects other people. The Social Problem-solving unit derives from a model articulated by Spivak and Shure (1974) and implemented by Weissberg, Caplan, and Bennetto (1988) with the Control Signals Poster (CSP). The CSP is a traffic light with a red light to signal "Stop—Calm Down," a yellow light for "Go Slow—Think," and a green light to signal "Go—Try My Plan." At the bottom of the poster are the instructions, "Evaluate—How Did My Plan Work?" Children are introduced, through the CSP, to a simple, active model of social problem-solving.

PATHS lessons are sequenced according to increasing developmental difficulty and include didactic instruction, work sheets, role-playing, class discussion, and modeling and reinforcement by teachers and peers. In addition, the curriculum promotes generalization of what children are learning. The CSP poster is displayed, for example, throughout the school day, and

teachers are coached on how to incorporate the model into other classroom activities.

PATHS has a teacher training component, wherein teachers attend an initial 3-day training session. They receive ongoing support and supervision by project staff. The PATHS curriculum has been implemented as one component of the FAST Track intervention. FAST Track was designed to prevent the emergence of conduct disorder among developmentally at-risk children (Bierman & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1996; Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1992). It consists of multiple components, including parent training, home visiting and case management, social-skills training, academic tutoring, and teacher-implemented classroom intervention (PATHS).[1] The classroom component (PATHS) is administered to all children in the intervention schools.

Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO)

FHAO is a national program for middle and high school students that aims to prevent violence and promote intergroup understanding by challenging students to critically examine a series of moral questions raised by historical events of the 20th century. The FHAO program, which is usually taught in social studies or language arts classes, varies markedly in implementation from school to school. However, a central component of each program is the consideration of the Holocaust as well as other incidences of genocide (e.g., Cambodia and Armenia). Furthermore, FHAO programs all follow the same general sequence of principles (Barr, Schultz, Selman, & FHAO, 1998). These principles are based on a developmental framework which poses that the ability to differentiate and coordinate the perspectives of self and others is a key interpersonal social cognitive skill and prerequisite for skilled interpersonal negotiation and moral understanding and action (Schultz & Selman, 1999). The curriculum begins by prompting students to reflect on their own identity, group membership, and obligation to others. Through a textbook, films such as *Schindler's List*, novels, and/or guest speakers (e.g. Holocaust survivors), students examine the perspectives and the choices of different historical players in Nazi Germany, including perpetrators, resisters, and bystanders. The program then challenges students to make moral judgements about these choices, to assess right and wrong, guilt, and responsibility. Finally, students are encouraged to make connections between these historical studies and their own lives when appropriate, leading to an examination of how to prevent future violence through positive civic participation.

The FHAO curriculum typically varies in duration from four weeks to an entire semester. Additionally, teachers are encouraged to implement FHAO's curricular themes through the school day and academic year. In this way, the FHAO program endeavors to permeate the culture of a classroom. In addition to the curriculum, FHAO offers teachers initial intensive training workshops and ongoing support and coaching from FHAO staff. The amount of training received by teachers varies. In the study reviewed here, FHAO was implemented as a 10-week course by experienced and well-trained FHAO teachers (Schultz & Selman, 1999).

Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP)

The RCCP has developed a practice-based developmental theory that presumes that while aggression is part of human nature, aggressive behaviors are learned, so alternate strategies can be taught. The specific objectives of the program are to (a) make children aware of the different choices they have for dealing with conflicts, (b) help children develop skills for making these choices, (c) encourage children's respect for their own culture and those of others, (d) teach children how to identify and stand against prejudice, and (e) make children aware of their role in creating a more peaceful world (Ba & Hawkins,

1996). The main goal of the RCCP is to change the beliefs and interpersonal negotiation strategies that lead to aggression and violence among children by teaching constructive conflict resolution strategies and promoting positive intergroup relations.

The RCCP was developed for children in first through twelfth grade. The main component of the program is a 31-lesson curriculum, with several versions tailored to different ages. Other components include teacher and administrator training, ongoing support for teachers by program staff developers, parent outreach, and peer mediation.

Curricular units are organized around several core skills, including communication, expressing feelings and dealing with anger, resolving conflicts, fostering cooperation, appreciating diversity, and countering bias. Lessons are conducted in a "workshop" format with high levels of student participation; the teacher acts only as a facilitator. Activities include role-playing, interviewing, small-group discussions, and brainstorming sessions. Lessons are designed to last between one-half and one hour, but there is considerable flexibility for teacher implementation.

The RCCP includes intensive teacher training and support, parent outreach, and peer mediation. Teacher training consists of an introductory and an advanced course, ongoing classroom-based follow-up and support, and facilitation of regular meetings with other trained teachers. During training, teachers practice the skills they will be teaching so they will be able to effectively model and convey them. Staff developers also hold training sessions for interested parents. In the peer mediation component, select students are given opportunities to practice the conflict resolution skills they have learned by assisting in settling other children's conflicts during lunch and recess. Through these components, the RCCP aims to change not only individual children's behavior but also the school climate and culture.

Program Evaluations

In this section we describe the evaluations of the three programs. We discuss their theory-driven research design and methodology, report immediate and follow-up findings, and comment on the limitations facing each evaluation (see Table 1, p. 4).

Providing Alternative THinking Strategies (PATHS)

According to Greenberg's ABCD model of development (Greenberg et al., 1995), children's abilities to recognize and understand emotions and to utilize constructive strategies to express their emotions are developmental precursors of children's social behavior and well-being. PATHS accordingly aims to reduce children's externalizing and internalizing behavior problems by helping them develop these underlying competencies and processes.

Several evaluations have established PATHS's effectiveness in changing children's affective understanding and reducing externalizing and internalizing problems (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999; Greenberg et al., 1995; Greenberg & Kusche, 1999). All have been experimental trials with random assignment either at the level of the classroom or the school. The evaluations have been conducted with regular-education as well as special-education children in the early elementary grades.

In one study, 286 regular- and special-education students in grades 2 and 3 were randomly assigned to either a PATHS classroom or a control class (Greenberg et al., 1995). The sample was 58% Caucasian, 32% African-American, and 10% other ethnicities. Four PATHS lessons per week from October to May improved the intervention group's use of affective vocabulary, their ability to cite appropriate examples of their affective experiences, their beliefs about their ability to manage their emotions, and their understanding of cues for recognizing others' emotions. Additionally the special-education

children and children classified as high-risk, based on teacher reports of externalizing and internalizing problems, showed significant improvement in their understanding of how others manage feelings and how feelings can be changed. In a second randomized trial of 94 special-education students (average age = 8.6 years [Greenberg & Kusche, 1999]), the PATHS intervention led to improved peer relations and frustration tolerance and lower levels of internalizing behavior and depressive symptomatology in the intervention group. A 2-year follow-up showed that the intervention significantly slowed the rates of increase of internalizing and externalizing problems, compared to the control group (Greenberg & Kusche, 1999).

The FAST Track evaluation, which is very large in scope, allowed for a classroom-level analysis of the effects of PATHS (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999). The randomized trial encompassed assignment to 198 first-grade intervention classrooms and 180 control group classrooms. The sample was split approximately evenly between Caucasian and African-American children. Students received an average of 48 PATHS lessons over the course of one school year (range = 13-57 lessons). Results indicated that PATHS classrooms had lower levels of aggression and disruption, as rated by children, and had a climate more conducive to learning, as rated by observers. In addition, fidelity of implementation and dosage effects were assessed. Observers' ratings of fidelity of teacher implementation were significantly positively related to observer-rated classroom atmosphere and negatively related to teacher-rated aggressive behavior. Dosage was positively related to observer-rated classroom atmosphere. These findings showed that both high dosage and high fidelity of implementation were associated with increased program effectiveness. Furthermore, PATHS's effectiveness did not differ across sites, indicating no major effect of urban versus rural schools or socioeconomic and ethnic composition of classrooms (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999).

As described above, PATHS has been evaluated as a stand-alone curriculum and as part of a larger, multimodal intervention targeting at-risk children (FAST Track). One limitation of the evaluations to date is that their focus, as well as the conceptual focus of the PATHS curriculum, has been on individual-level change (Greenberg et al., 1995). FAST Track, on the other hand, endeavors to affect schools on multiple levels. When evaluating the overall effects of FAST Track, it is important to investigate how much these effects result from the PATHS curriculum alone and how much owe to the structural changes induced by the FAST Track components. The evaluations are also limited in that they have assessed just one year of exposure to the intervention. Even though one year has produced effects, it is important to consider the possible additive effects of multiple years of exposure—which the FAST Track evaluation plans to do (Conduct Problems Prevention Group, 1999).

Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO)

The Group for the Study of Interpersonal Development (GSID) based its evaluation of FHAO on the theoretical proposition that a core process in the development of social competence is perspective coordination, or the ability to affectively and cognitively differentiate and coordinate the perspectives of self and others (Shultz & Selman, 1999). It is posited (Selman et al., 1992) that perspective coordination develops out of the interaction of three types of competencies: (1) interpersonal understanding, the theoretical knowledge of the nature of relationships; (2) interpersonal skills, the negotiation strategies necessary to form and maintain mature relationships; and (3) personal meaning, the quality and intensity of affective investment that one is able to make in specific relationships with other people. Five developmental levels of perspective coordination are differentiated: egocentric, one-way, reciprocal, mutual, and interdependent. Each stage corresponds with differ-

ent levels of interpersonal understanding, interpersonal skills, and personal meaning. As individuals develop along these levels, their maturity in relationships grows (Selman et al., 1992). Individuals' relationship maturity influences the quality of interpersonal and intergroup relationships as well as their social behavior (Schultz, Barr, & Selman, 2000).

FHAO focuses on drawing connections between students' personal lives and the lives of specific individuals within the context of historical events. It was predicted that program participation, which emphasizes the importance of intergroup understanding, would facilitate the development of perspective coordination, overall relationship maturity, moral reasoning, racist attitudes, civic participation, and fighting behavior (Schultz & Selman, 1999). In light of these predictions, the GSID evaluated the effectiveness of FHAO by assessing the various components of students' relationship maturity (including interpersonal understanding, interpersonal skills, and personal meaning, in addition to perspective coordination) as well as their fighting behavior, expressed racism, moral reasoning, and civic participation. Using a quasi-experimental design, the evaluation compared the students of four experienced eighth-grade FHAO teachers, teaching a total of 14 classes (2 to 5 classes per teacher), with those of five comparison teachers, teaching a total of 8 classes (1 to 2 classes per teacher). Comparison teachers were chosen because they taught in the same communities as the FHAO teachers (although at different schools) and also expressed interest in teaching about intergroup understanding, although they did not use the FHAO curriculum. The 409 participating eighth-grade students (FHAO students = 246) were pretested at the beginning of the school year and posttested in the spring. The sample was 62% Caucasian, 6% African-American, 3.5% Hispanic, and 23% other ethnicities, with 5.5% of the participants failing to report their ethnicity. The intervention consisted of a 10-week FHAO curriculum taught in either social studies or language arts class, although teachers continued to use FHAO themes throughout the year.

The two groups were similar on relevant measures at pretest, except that the FHAO group scored significantly higher on the racism scale. Initial analyses tested whether there were strong teacher effects, independent of intervention group effects, on the outcome variables, but none were found (Schultz & Selman, 1999). There were a number of differences between intervention groups though. Relative to the comparison group, FHAO students increased in overall relationship maturity over the school year and in all individual components except perspective coordination. Those in the comparison group showed a decrease in relationship maturity over the course of the year. FHAO students also showed a significant decline in racist attitudes. There were no differences between groups in fighting, but when FHAO students were continuing to fight, they maintained a significantly higher relationship maturity rating than the comparison students who continued to fight. The program did not affect students' moral reasoning or civic participation.

The results of the FHAO evaluation suggest that the program affected students' relationship maturity, attitudes, and behavior. But although the program had an impact on the antecedents of perspective coordination, groups did not differ on perspective coordination itself. Furthermore, although the program bolstered the relationship maturity of FHAO students who continued to fight over the course of the year, the groups did not differ overall on rates of fighting behavior.

Several design limitations may have prevented the detection of stronger program effects. At 10-weeks, FHAO was of relatively short duration; perhaps this was not long enough for the program to fully affect participants' relationship maturity. In addition, there was no follow-up to assess whether the program promoted further perspective coordination. Next, the participants were adolescents, whose developmental trajectories may be more difficult to influence than

younger children (Ramey & Ramey, 1998). And finally, although teachers with program experience were chosen to participate, the evaluation did not assess the fidelity of their implementation of the curriculum. The GSID did conduct a qualitative study of one FHAO classroom. This study showed that the program, as implemented in that one classroom, effectively challenged students to grapple with moral issues and to connect the historical events being studied to their personal lives (Barr et al., 1998).

Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP)

The evaluation of the RCCP, conducted by the National Center for Children in Poverty at Columbia University, focused on over 8,000 children and nearly 400 teachers from 15 public elementary schools in New York City. Data were collected from children in grades 1–6 and their teachers over two consecutive school years, with fall and spring assessments each year. At the time of the evaluation, the RCCP had already been implemented in New York City for over a decade. To increase external validity, the study used a quasi-experimental design, not an experimental design with random assignment (for rationale, see Aber, Brown, Chaudry, Jones, & Samples, 1996). Classrooms were grouped based on teacher level of RCCP implementation. Whereas teachers' assignment to the intervention group was not random, children's placement into classrooms was arbitrary and independent of teachers' participation in the RCCP.

Initially, the evaluation assessed variation in children's exposure to the curricular, teacher training and coaching, and peer mediation components of the RCCP. In Year 1 of the evaluation (n = 5,053, grades 2–6), the evaluators, together with the RCCP staff, identified different classroom profiles of program implementation based on the amount of training and coaching teachers received from RCCP staff developers, the number of curriculum lessons taught, and the percentage of peer mediators in the classroom. Three distinct profiles were identified through cluster analysis. The High Lessons profile was characterized by teachers who received a moderate amount of training and taught many RCCP lessons (mean = 23) and had a classroom composition with relatively few peer mediators. The Low Lessons profile was characterized by teachers who received the most training and coaching and taught few RCCP lessons (mean = 2) and had a classroom composition with the highest percentage of peer mediators. The No Lessons profile was characterized by teachers who received no training and taught no RCCP lessons but had classrooms with some peer mediators.

The theoretical orientation of the evaluation was arrived at through a collaboration between evaluators from the National Center for Children in Poverty at Columbia University and RCCP program developers. Through this collaboration, the RCCP's implicit practice-based theory was made explicit through the application of social information processing theory (Dodge, 1986) and developmental-structural theory (Selman, Beardslee, Schultz, Krupa, & Poderesky, 1986). These theories posit that certain social-cognitive processes predispose individuals to aggression. Such processes include (a) hostile attribution bias, i.e., the tendency to view the ambiguous actions of others as hostile in intent; (b) aggressive fantasies; (c) aggressive strategies for resolving conflicts with others; and (d) competent strategies for resolving conflict with others. It was predicted that the program would reduce children's aggressive behaviors by altering these thought patterns and teaching constructive strategies for resolving conflicts. The evaluation also assessed changes in teacher-reported aggressive and prosocial behavior as well as changes in children's performance on achievement tests (Aber et al., 1996).

Independent of intervention status, all children's aggressive thought patterns and behaviors increased significantly and their selection of competent problem-solving strategies decreased significantly from the fall to the spring of the first year. Compared to children in the Low Lessons

and No Lessons profiles, however, children in the High Lessons profile had significantly slower growth in the use of aggressive strategies and a halting of the growth in hostile attribution bias, aggressive fantasies, and teacher-reported aggressive behavior, as well as in the decline of competent strategies (Aber, Jones, Brown, Chaudry, & Samples, 1998; Aber, Brown, & Henrich, 1999). Children in the High Lessons profile also showed the most significant increases in teacher-rated prosocial behavior as well as in academic achievement, compared to children in the other two profiles (Aber, Brown, & Henrich, 1999). Interestingly, children in the Low Lessons profile did worse than children in the No Lessons profile on several outcomes.

Children's grade and gender, classroom-level beliefs about the acceptability of aggressive behavior, and neighborhood risk identified by levels of neighborhood poverty and violence were also taken into account as moderating factors. Whereas the High Lessons profile showed positive effects among all subgroups, the benefits were slightly reduced for younger children, boys, children in aggressive classrooms, and children in higher-risk neighborhoods.

Preliminary analyses testing RCCP effects over both years of the evaluation revealed a similar pattern of findings. When each implementation profile from Year 1 was combined with an equivalent implementation group in Year 2, the positive effects of the High Lessons profile were maintained. Further, when taking into account the effects of the other implementation components, higher numbers of RCCP lessons were independently related in each of the two school years to slowed growth in children's hostile attributions and aggressive problem-solving strategies. These findings testify to the robustness of the High Lessons effects (Aber, Jones, Brown, & Mathew, 1999).

This optimism is tempered, however, by the finding that being in the Low Lessons profile was slightly more detrimental than receiving no RCCP intervention. This finding suggests that fidelity of teacher implementation is key to effectiveness—but implementation fidelity was not directly assessed in the evaluation. A post hoc examination of several possible explanations for the negative effect of Low Lessons, including teacher "burnout" and level of experience, revealed no differences among teachers in the three implementation profiles (Mathew, 1999).

One limitation of the RCCP evaluation design is that not all program components were evaluated. Evaluation efforts focused on the effects of teacher training and coaching and on curricular lessons. Although the peer mediation component was included in the assessment of the classroom implementation of the RCCP, the impact of this component requires further attention to be fully understood. The parent outreach component of the program was not evaluated at all. Furthermore, although the evaluation results indicated that the number of lessons taught is key to the effectiveness of the program, the design did not assess variation in the quality of how the lessons were taught or in teachers' understanding and internalization of the skills they were teaching (see, Adalbarnardottir, 1999; Adalbarnardottir & Selman, 1997).

Implications of Evaluations for the Study of School-Based Violence Prevention

As laid out above, program evaluations should be theoretically informed, assess the impact of multiple components and of variation in duration, be sensitive to the fidelity and dosage of implementation, and be representative of a balance of methodological approaches. Consideration of these three program evaluations, taken together, allows us to make stronger conclusions regarding the effectiveness of school-based violence prevention.

Theoretical Basis

All three studies were evaluated from developmental theoretical perspectives that accorded

with program design. Predictions were derived from these perspectives about the underlying processes that contribute to the development of violent behavior and how these developmental processes and trajectories can be altered. As a result, the evaluations were able to assess program effects on students' behavior and also on their thoughts, feelings, and social competencies which are known to influence behavior.

Furthermore, the theoretical underpinnings of the three programs and their evaluations, although not identical, are quite similar to one another. All posit that aggressive and violent behavior has developmental antecedents in basic interpersonal competencies and thoughts and feelings, that by enhancing these competencies and thought patterns, programs will affect a much broader range of outcomes than just aggression and violence. They additionally bolster prosocial skills and facilitate a host of adaptive behaviors. The results of the three evaluations support this approach: in addition to reducing aggressive behavior, the programs fostered an array of adaptive behaviors. Results showed, for example, increased prosocial behavior and academic achievement, and decreased internalizing problems and racist attitudes.

The strength of these findings could be further bolstered through outcome analyses that would test the causal mechanisms of change (Reynolds, 1998). This approach entails testing whether initial program impact on participants' competencies and thought patterns mediates changes in their aggressive and violent behavior.

Multiple Components

PATHS (as part of FAST Track) and RCCP are programs with multiple components, and both curricula were evaluated as parts embedded within a larger intervention scheme. Also, these two evaluations showed more group differences in outcomes than did the FHAO evaluation. It could be that other parts of the larger intervention account for these differences, but the design of the PATHS and RCCP evaluations prevents a test of this possibility. Future evaluations should assess the impact of each of the multiple components on all outcome variables. And particular attention should be paid to components, such as parent outreach programs, that are aimed at changing children's environments outside the school walls.

Fidelity and Dosage of Implementation

All three evaluations highlight the importance of investigating fidelity and dosage of implementation for program effectiveness. The RCCP evaluation found the Low Lessons profile (with abundant teacher training and coaching, but few lessons taught) was associated with the least program effectiveness. It is plausible that the training component targeted the least skilled teachers for greater support, and that both poor fidelity (lack of teacher competence) and low dosage (few lessons) contributed to the result.

The PATHS as part of FAST Track evaluation was designed to assess the unique effects of both implementation fidelity (assessed by observers) and number of lessons taught (reported by teachers). The results showed that these implementation factors each contributed independently to program effectiveness. The FHAO evaluation, on the other hand, endeavored to take into account the effects of fidelity and dosage by establishing the comparability of the teachers who were delivering the program.

Extended Duration of Implementation and Evaluation

All three evaluations evidenced program effects after just 1 year of intervention. And one evaluation of PATHS indicated that its effects were retained after 2 years. Moreover, in the RCCP evaluation, children who received 2 years of the intervention did significantly better on many of the outcome variables compared to children who received just 1 year (Aber et al., 1999). This finding suggests that the longer the duration of this intervention, the greater its effectiveness.

Furthermore, the FHAO evaluation indicated that the program might have shown stronger effects had it either lasted longer or been evaluated later. Thus, the three interventions highlight the importance of implementing and evaluating programs over extended periods of time. As an example, FAST Track is in the process of following children who have received up to 5 years of the PATHS intervention (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999).

Methods

An important advantage to examining these studies together is that all three evaluations employed complementary and methodologically rigorous designs. The PATHS evaluations utilized random assignment, thus optimizing the internal validity of the evaluation and permitting strong attributions of causality. The RCCP evaluation utilized a quasi-experimental design that assessed the program as it was actually being implemented at scale, thus optimizing the external validity of the evaluation and the generalizability of the findings. The FHAO evaluation employed another quasi-experimental design in which experienced FHAO teachers were compared to a matched comparison group. All three evaluations found group differences in the development of aggression and both violent and prosocial behavior. Together, they suggest that school-based violence prevention programs can change children and that their effects can be generalized to a broad range of schools and communities.

Policy Implications and Challenges

These three evaluations demonstrate the promise of school-based social and emotional learning programs by showing that interpersonal competencies can be taught in school and that teaching these competencies results in reduced levels of aggression. These findings have potentially broad implications for educational reform, particularly now amidst the media attention and heightened public awareness generated by recent incidents of school violence. While program evaluation efforts continue, the evidence to date from the programs reviewed here challenges educational leaders and policymakers to question the separation in current school reform initiatives between efforts to promote children's academic performance and efforts to promote their social-emotional development. These programs represent a potential sea change in educational philosophy, one that could redefine not only the content of academic curricula, but also the role played by teachers, classrooms, and schools in the educational lives of children. Program designers and evaluators need to address additional challenges before parents, educators, and policymakers can be expected to welcome social and emotional learning and a focus on violence prevention as a core curricular component of children's education. These challenges include answering some further research questions and communicating the implications of research findings more effectively.

Research Questions

To persuade parents, educators, and policymakers of the effectiveness of social and emotional learning, researchers need to address two questions: (1) do the programs promote, have no effect on, or interfere with children's academic achievement; and (2) are they cost effective? While the evaluations described here are moving in the right direction, neither question has been thoroughly investigated.

Promotion of children's academic achievement is implicit in the theoretical perspectives that underlie all three programs and their evaluations. The programs aim to reduce aggression and violence by bolstering children's social competencies in general. Interpersonal maturity and academic maturity are related (Greenberg et al., 1995; Weissberg & Greenberg, 1998); and as children become more socially competent and experience less conflict with their classmates, they may be able to focus more on their academ-

ic work. Academic achievement, however, is infrequently articulated as a primary goal of these programs. Nevertheless it is the primary goal of parents, educators, and policymakers. Of the three program evaluations, only the RCCP evaluation measured children's academic achievement. The High Lessons profile experienced significant improvements in achievement, which suggests that social and emotional learning may facilitate, rather than hinder, traditional academic learning. If replicated in truly experimental evaluations, we believe this finding should be carefully considered by advocates of "back to basics" approaches before social and emotional learning is dismissed. Future evaluations should continue to assess academic achievement as an outcome variable.

Furthermore, parents, educators, and policymakers need to be shown that the benefits of programs are worth the investment. Cost information from two of the programs, PATHS and RCCP, shows they are relatively inexpensive. The PATHS curriculum, with teacher training and support, is estimated to cost just $80 per child per year (Greenberg & Kusche, 1998). The curricular and teacher training and support components of the RCCP are estimated to cost just $98 per child for the first year (Aber et al., 1999). Calculating and communicating cost is an important first step, but it is also important to conduct long-term follow-ups of children in order to establish the savings made by prevention. Such research establishing the cost-effectiveness of school-based violence prevention programs will require the collaboration of economists with developmental psychologists and program evaluators.

In addition, more research is needed to identify the factors that determine program effectiveness. The evidence to date is encouraging, but we have yet to specify and test the active ingredients of effective school-based violence prevention programs. Identification of these ingredients will allow for powerful replication and expanded programming. The Consortium for Policy Research in Education, for example, is studying the common ingredients underlying the various types of successful whole school reform initiatives. Effective policy-relevant research of prevention programs also promotes the use of common measures and methods.

Finally, prevention programs should not be "sold" on their own. They should be packaged as components of broader efforts to make schools and communities safer. Many schools have responded to the recent reports of school violence with physical safety precautions, such as installation of metal detectors, increased surveillance, or closed campuses. Although yet to be tested, prevention programs may be more effective when implemented in schools that make additional investments in violence reduction.

Communication

To affect educational policy, findings of evaluations and their implications for education must be effectively communicated to parents, educators, and policymakers. PATHS and RCCP have taken steps to publish their findings on the World Wide Web, and the RCCP has published a report targeting policymakers. But additional steps are needed—particularly a focus on comprehensive strategies to inform the broader educational establishment: social and emotional learning in school needs to be supported at all levels within school districts.

In the next decade, as an estimated 2.2 million new teachers are hired in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 1999), the educational community will have unprecedented opportunities to train a new generation of teachers in the use of social and emotional learning to reduce aggression, promote social competence, and bolster academic achievement. Toward this end, the Collaborative for Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) supports two working groups. The Research and Guidelines Working Group is charged with identifying effective practices for teaching social and emotional learning and communicating these practices to educators. The Educator Preparation Working Group is charged with designing strategies to encourage educators

to incorporate social and emotional learning into their curricula. These strategies include publishing booklets for educators, sponsoring national and international conferences, and developing teacher training courses that focus on social and emotional learning. These CASEL initiatives illustrate steps that program designers and evaluator need to take to address the challenges of maximizing the policy impact of their work.

In conclusion, the evaluations reviewed here demonstrate that school-based violence prevention programs can be effective. The next steps for program designers and evaluators include addressing the research questions that the public cares the most about and communicating this research on multiple fronts—to the public, policymakers, and the educational establishment.

Notes

[1]FAST Track used a version of PATHS that did not include the Turtle Technique.

References

Aber, J. L., Brown, J. L., Chaudry, N., Jones, S. & Samples, F. (1996). The evaluation of the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program: An overview. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, Youth Violence Prevention: Description and Baseline Data from 13 Evaluation Projects*, Supplement to *12*(5), 82–90.

Aber, J. L., Brown, J. L. & Henrich, C. C. (1999). *Teaching conflict resolution: An effective school-based approach to violence prevention*. National Center for Children in Poverty, Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University.

Aber, J. L., Brown, J. L., Jones, S. M., & Mathew, K. E. (1999, April). *Impact of the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program on aggression-related cognitions and behaviors over two years*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Aber, J. L., Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., Chaudry, N., & Samples, F. (1998). Resolving conflict creatively: Evaluating the developmental effects of a school-based violence prevention program in neighborhood and classroom context. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 187–213.

Adalbarnardottir, S. (1999). Tracing the developmental processes of teachers and students: A sociomoral approach in school. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research 43*(1), 57–79.

Adalbarnardottir, S., & Selman, R. L. (1997). "I feel I have received a new vision": An analysis of teachers' professional development as they work with students on interpersonal issues. *Teaching & Teacher Education 13*, 409–428.

Ba, H., & Hawkins, J. (1996). *Resolving Conflict Creatively Program evaluation project*. New York: Education Development Center, Inc.

Barr, D. B., Schultz, L., Selman, R., & FHAO (1998). Final report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University.

Bierman, K. L., & Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1996). Integrating social-skills training interventions with parent training and family-focused support to prevent conduct disorder in high-risk populations: The Fast Track multisite demonstration project. In C. F. Ferris, T. Grisso, et al. (Eds.), *Understanding aggressive behavior in children. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 794 (pp. 256–264). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Brener, N. D., Simon, T.R., Krug, E. G., & Lowry, R. (1999). Recent trends in violence-related behaviors among high school students in the United States. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 282,* 440–446.

Bruene-Butler, L., Hampson, J., Elias, M., Clabby, J., & Schuyler, T. (1997). The Improving Social Awareness-Social Problem Solving Project. In G. W. Albee & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Primary prevention works* (pp. 239–267). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Caplan, M., Weissberg, R. P., Grober, J. S., Sivo, P. J., Grady, K., & Jacoby, C. (1992). Social competence promotion with inner-city and suburban young adolescents: Effects on social adjustment and alcohol use. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 60,* 56–63.

Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1998). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In W. Damon (Ed. in Chief) and N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology. Volume 3: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 779–862). New York: John Wiley.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1992). A developmental and clinical model for the prevention of conduct disorders: The FAST Track Program. *Development and Psychopathology, 4,* 509–527.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1999). Initial impact of the Fast Track Prevention Trial for Conduct Problems: II. Classroom effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67,* 648–657.

Consortium on the School-Based Promotion of Social Competence. (1994). The school-based promotion of social competence: Theory, research, practice, and policy. In R. J. Haggerty, L. R. Sherrod, N. Garmezy, & M. Rutter (Eds.), *Stress, risk, and resilience in children and adolescents: Processes, mechanisms, and interventions* (pp. 268–316). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dodge, K. J. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), *Minnesota Symposium in Child Psychology* (vol. 18, pp. 77–125). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1990). *Adolescents at risk: Prevalence and prevention.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Durlak, J. A., & Wells, A. M. (1997). Primary prevention mental health programs for children and adolescents: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25,* 115–152.

Greenberg, M. T., & Kusche, C. A. (1998). *Promoting alternative thinking strategies.* Boulder, CO: Institute of Behavioral Sciences, University of Colorado.

Greenberg, M. T., & Kusche, C. A. (1999, April). *Reducing growth in behavioral and emotional problems in at-risk children: The continuing effects of the PATHS curriculum.* Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Greenberg, M. T., Kusche, C. A., Cook, E. T., & Quamma, J. P. (1995). Promoting emotional competence in school-aged deaf children: The effects of the PATHS curriculum. *Development and Psychopathology, 7,* 117–136.

Hawkins, J. D., Von Cleve, E., & Catalano, R. F. (1991). Reducing early childhood aggression: Results of a primary prevention program. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 30,* 208–217.

Kusche, C. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (1994). *The PATHS Curriculum.* Seattle: Developmental Research and Programs.

Mathew, K. (1999, April). *The role of teacher characteristics in the implementation of a school-based violence prevention program.* Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Ramey, C. T., & Ramey, S. L. (1998). Early intervention and early experience. *American Psychologist, 53,* 109–120.

Reynolds, A. J. (1998). Confirmatory program evaluation: A method for strengthening causal

inference. *American Journal of Education, 19*, 203–221.

Schneider, M., & Robin, A. (1978). *Manual for the Turtle Technique*. Unpublished manual, Department of Psychology, State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Schultz, L. H., Barr, D. J., & Selman, R.L. (2000). *The value of a developmental approach to evaluating character education programs: An outcome study of Facing History and Ourselves*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Schultz, L. H., & Selman, R. L. (1999). *The meaning and measurement of social competence from a developmental perspective*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Schultz, L.H., Selman, R.L., Barr, D.J., & Daiute, C. (1999, August). *Meaning-centered approaches to the evaluation of violence prevention programs in the public schools*. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Selman, R. L., Beardslee, W., Schultz, L. H., Krupa, M., & Poderesky, D. (1986). Assessing adolescent interpersonal negotiation strategies: Toward the integration of structural and functional models. *Developmental Psychology, 22*, 450–459.

Selman, R. L., Schultz, L. H., Nakkula, M., Barr, D., Watts, C., & Richmond, J. (1992). Friendship and fighting: A developmental approach to the study of risk and the prevention of violence. *Development and Psychopathology, 4*, 529–558.

Shure, M. B. (1997). Interpersonal cognitive problem solving: Primary prevention of early high-risk behaviors in the preschool and primary years. In G. W. Albee & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Primary prevention works* (pp. 167–188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spivak, G., & Shure, M. B. (1974). *Social adjustment of young children: A cognitive approach to solving real life problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *A back to school special report on the baby boom echo: No end in sight*. Washington, DC: Author.

Weissberg, R. P., Barton, H. A., & Shriver, T. P. (1997). The social competence promotion program for young adolescents. In G. W. Albee & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Primary prevention works* (pp. 268–290). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weissberg, R. P., & Bell, D. N. (1997). A meta-analytic review of primary prevention programs for children and adolescents: Contributions and caveats. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*, 207–214.

Weissberg, R. P., Caplan, M., & Bennetto, L. (1988). *The Yale-New Haven Social Problem-Solving Program for Young Adolescents*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Weissberg, R. P., Caplan, M., & Harwood, R. L. (1991). Promoting competent young people in competence-enhancing environments: A systems-based perspective on primary prevention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 830–841.

Weissberg, R. P., Gesten, E. L., Carnrike, C. L., Toro, P. A., Rapkin, B. D., Davidson, E., & Cowen, E. (1981). Social problem solving skills training: A competence building intervention with second- to fourth-grade children. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*, 411–423.

Weissberg, R. P., & Greenberg, M. T. (1998). School and community competence-enhancement and prevention programs. In I. E. Sigel & A. Renninger (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (5th edit.). *Volume 4: Child psychology in practice* (pp. 955–998). New York: John Wiley.

About the Authors

Christopher C. Henrich, a doctoral candidate in psychology at Yale University and a fellow of the Yale Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, interned at the National Center for Children in Poverty in 1999.

Joshua L. Brown is a research associate at the National Center for Children in Poverty and a doctoral candidate in psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University. He is also the current project manager of the RCCP evaluation.

J. Lawrence Aber, Ph.D., is the director of the National Center for Children in Poverty and associate professor of public health at the Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health at Columbia University. He is the principal investigator of the evaluation of the RCCP.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Mark Greenberg, Robert Selman, Lynn Schultz, Dennis Barr, and Tom Roderick for providing additional information about the programs and evaluations profiled here, as well as for their thoughtful feedback during the preparation of this *Report*. We also thank the many staff, evaluation team members, and funders of each of the three programs and evaluations. This report benefited from the critical comments provided by Marc Zimmerman, and our special thanks to Nancy Thomas for her editorial guidance.

BRIEF

U.S. Department of Justice Initiatives on School Violence

Peter Finn, Law and Public Policy Area, Abt Associates

The U.S. Department of Justice has supported a number of initiatives designed to reduce violence in the Nation's schools:

- The COPS in Schools Grant Program was initiated in 1998 by the Justice Department's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) to increase the presence of School Resource Officers (SROs) in schools. As of 1997, about 9,400 locally funded police officers were already working as SROs. There were SROs in 10% of the Nation's public schools that year—18% of middle schools and 27% of high schools. As of 1999, the COPS Office had awarded grants to 1,056 law enforcement agencies to place an additional 2,224 SROs in schools.

- The School-Based Partnerships Grant Program, initiated by the COPS Office in 1998, funds 155 jurisdictions to assist police agencies to collaborate with schools and community-based organizations to analyze persistent school-related problems. The COPS office had awarded $16.5 million in partnership grants by the end of 1998 and in May 1999 announced additional funding of $1.5 million. There are currently 155 COPS Office School-Based Partnership Sites.

- The Youth Firearms Violence Initiative, also funded by the COPS Office, provided funding to support targeted enforcement efforts directed at combating the rise of youth firearms violence in 10 cities. The initiatives in the 10 jurisdictions focused on firearms violence occurring in schools as well as "hot spots." Up to $1 million was made available to each of the departments. The one-year program began in the fall of 1995, but in a number of cities the program continued into 1997.

- The Safe Schools/Healthy Student Initiative, announced on April 1, 1999, represents a partnership among three federal agencies, the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. Grant awards are designed to help coordinate new and existing community-based services and prevention activities into a single comprehensive, communitywide approach to violence prevention.

  The initiative has awarded grants totaling more than $100 million to 54 local educational authorities and their mental health and law enforcement partners. Grant awards range from $1 to $3 million per year depending on the size of the school district applying.

  School districts and their partners may apply for funding to a single federal source, the Justice Department's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The OJJDP contributed $15 million of the initiative's first-year $100 million funding.

- The Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence, run by George Washington University, was founded in 1997 to serve as a national resource to test the effectiveness of school violence prevention methods and to develop more effective prevention strategies. The institute subcontracts with seven universities to develop partnerships on violence prevention with local schools or school systems. The universities also use the funds to administer a pre/post survey to measure changes in student problem behavior. The institute's goal is to analyze the data submitted by the universities to determine what works and what can be replicated to reduce violence in schools. The U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention provides the institute with $1.9 to $2.5 million each year. In 1999 each university received $260,000.

Past Issues

Volume IX (1995)

No. 1 *Escaping poverty: The promise of higher education.* Erika Kates

No. 2 *The U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child: Its relevance for social scientists.* Susan P. Limber & Målfrid Grude Flekkøy

No. 3 *Children who witness violence: The invisible victims.* Joy D. Osofsky

Volume X (1996)

No. 1 *Latin American immigration and U.S. Schools.* Claude Goldenberg

Nos. 2 & 3 *Is the emperor wearing clothes? Social policy and the empirical support for full inclusion of children with disabilities in the preschool and early elementary grades.* Bryna Siegel

Inclusion at the preschool level: An ecological systems analysis. Samuel L. Odom, Charles A. Peck, Marci Hanson, Paula J. Beckman, Ann P. Kaiser, Joan Lieber, William H. Brown, Eva M. Horn, & Ilene S. Schwartz

No. 4 *Building research and policy connections: Training and career options for developmental scientists.* Amy R. Susman-Stillman, Joshua L. Brown, Emma K. Adam, Clancy Blair, Robin Gaines, Rachel A. Gordon, Ann Marie White, & Sheri R. Wynn

No. 5 *A reconceptualization of the effects of undernutrition on children's biological, psychosocial, and behavioral development.* Ernesto Pollitt, Mari Golub, Kathleen Gorman, Sally Grantham-McGregor, David Levitsky, Beat Schürch, Barbara Strupp, & Theodore Wachs

Volume XI (1997)

No. 1 *Schooling, the hidden curriculum, and children's conceptions of poverty.* Judith A. Chafel

No. 2 *Training the applied developmental scientist for prevention and practice: Two current examples.* Celia Fisher & Joy Osofsky

No. 3 *Public policy schools as opportunities for developmental scientists: An overview and illustration.* Rachel A. Gordon & P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale

Volume XII (1998)

No. 1 *Fathers' involvement with children: Perspectives from developing countries.* Patrice L. Engle & Cynthia Breaux

No. 2 *Investigating child care subsidy: What are we buying?* Helen Raikes

No. 3 *Implications of the 1996 welfare legislation for children: A research perspective.* Martha Zaslow, Kathryn Tout, Sheila Smith, & Kristin Moore

No. 4 *Improving the life chances of children in poverty: Assumptions and what we have learned.* Robert G. St.Pierre & Jean I. Layzer

Volume XIII (1999)

No. 1 *Beyond "giving science away": How university-community partnerships inform youth programs, research, and policy.* Jill Denner, Catherine R. Cooper, Edward M. Lopez, & Nora Dunbar

No. 2 *Perspectives on father involvement: Research and policy.* Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda & Natasha Cabrera

Social Policy Report *is a quarterly publication of the Society for Research in Child Development. The* Report *provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for the policies affecting children. Copyright of the articles published in the* Report *is maintained by SRCD. Statements appearing in the* Report *are the views of the author and do not imply endorsement by the Editor or by SRCD.*

Editor: Nancy G. Thomas
phone: (970) 925-5516 · fax: (970) 544-0662
e-mail: ngthomas@umich.edu

Subscriptions available at $15.00 to nonmembers of SRCD, single issues at $4.80, and multiple copies at reduced rates. Write or phone:

SRCD Executive Office • University of Michigan • 505 East Huron, Suite 301 • Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522
(313) 998-6578

SRCD Executive Office
University of Michigan
505 East Huron, Suite 301
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522

SOCIAL POLICY REPORT
Society for Research in Child Development

Volume XIII, Number 4 1999

Service Learning: Who Benefits and Why

Arthur A. Stukas, Jr., E. Gil Clary, and Mark Snyder

Although efforts to connect real-world experiences and traditional academic learning have a long and varied history (e.g., Hepburn, 1997; Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999), it is only in the last decade or so that such efforts have become widespread and firmly established in our educational institutions. Indeed, American society has embraced the notion of service learning and its cousin, experiential education, by establishing an increasing array of programs and policies. Most notable, perhaps, are the 1990 National and Community Service Act and 1993 National Service Trust Act, which funded President Clinton's AmeriCorps program and created the Corporation for National Service. State and local governments have also passed legislation to involve their student citizens in community service as a required part of education (e.g., Sobus, 1995). Maryland, for example, requires 75 hours of service for high school graduation (Finney, 1997), and the cities of St. Louis and Detroit require more than 200 hours (O'Keefe, 1997).

With this growth in programs has come a massive onslaught of educational research and discussion, seeking to define the "best practices" for service-learning programs and to document their effect (e.g., Giles & Eyler, 1998; Kendall & Associates, 1990; Kraft, 1996). Much of this research has been qualitative or nonexperimental, with anecdotal descriptions of programs and excerpts from student journals comprising the bulk. Also, in much of this research, self-selection into service programs may have played a role in determining the outcomes (e.g., Waterman, 1997). The self-selection problem undermines the validity of findings of beneficial outcomes from service learning. For example, in a recent study of high school students, apparent program effects on well-being, self-esteem, academic self-esteem, and grade-point average were nullified when preprogram factors that predict student volunteerism were taken into account (Johnson, Beebe, Mortimer, & Snyder, 1998). Thus, the best research on volunteerism uses experimental, or at least rigidly systematic, procedures. Fortunately, studies of this type seem to be on the rise, and we will synthesize the findings in this report. We note also that there are

Contents

Functions of Service Learning . . . 3
For the Student . . . 3
For the Institution . . . 10
For the Community . . . 12
Conclusion . . . 13
Brief
Federally funded Community Service Programs . . . 20

© 1999 Society for Research in Child Development. All rights reserved.

persuasive arguments favoring qualitative research, and qualitative researchers have made excellent contributions to the theoretical discussion of service learning (e.g., Dunlap, 1998; Rhoads, 1997; Serow, 1997; Yates, 1999). We nevertheless focus primarily on quantitative research here.

Any analysis of the effects of service learning needs to be attentive to the wide range of programs—and the many goals that programs seek to meet. For example, a summary of data from the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (containing information on 938 service-learning programs), showed that service-learning coordinators typically saw their programs as a way to enhance the personal growth of students, particularly their self-esteem and social responsibility (Shumer & Belbas, 1996). On average, coordinators viewed academic learning and achievement as only secondary functions of their programs. This may not be the view of instructors who include service-learning components in their academic courses, however, and one focus of research has been on whether service experiences can increase student grades and traditional academic performance. This single difference between service coordinators and instructors in thinking about the favored outcomes of service-learning programs highlights a very important point—not all service-learning programs are the same. Instead, programs vary considerably on many dimensions: type of service, length of service, population served, number of opportunities for reflection, coordinating organization, etc. (e.g., Furco, 1994, for a review of program typologies). Furthermore, programs may well vary in terms of the activities most appropriate to the students getting involved; for example, middle school students and college students may engage in and benefit from very different activities. One categorization of programs arranges them by type of intervention (ranging from direct to indirect interactions of students with the population served) and by the amount of commitment students must make (focusing on the frequency and duration of interactions). Variations along these dimensions may have significant implications for program outcomes (Delve, Mintz, & Stewart, 1990).

One major difference in service-learning programs is that some are "stand-alone" service courses that are not explicitly connected to a particular course's content and others are explicitly content-based, sometimes called "academic service-learning" programs (Howard, 1998). One observer (Alt, 1997) differentiates programs designed by "youth reformers," who seek to bolster students' values and ethics, from those designed by "education reformers," who seek to enhance students' motivation and learning. This distinction can be a useful heuristic for developing expectations about what service programs are able to accomplish. Indeed, it is suggested that individual service-learning programs cannot achieve the multitude of advertised benefits that are usually set forth for them by legislators and administrators. Most programs might achieve one or two chief goals (such as increasing academic achievement) by taking a more focused approach that includes careful design and implementation in pursuit of specific goals (Alt, 1997). Evaluation researchers must be careful not to generalize across programs (J. Miller, 1997), but instead should focus on those outcomes for which a program was designed or is most likely to produce (e.g., Kraft & Krug, 1994).

Although service-learning programs vary considerably in structure, from stand-alone courses designed to promote community involvement to narrowly focused courses that explicitly connect experiences and course content, they do share several structural features. Specifically, service-learning courses tend to involve both action and reflection on the part of students (e.g., Kendall & Associates, 1990). It is the reflection component, which often involves student journals and class discussions, that most differentiates service learning from other forms of volunteerism and community involvement (e.g., Hatcher & Bringle, 1997). And it is the reflection component and the surrounding edu-

cational context that serves to highlight the reciprocal nature of the community service activities at the center of service-learning programs (e.g., Greene, 1998). In other forms of service and helping, it may not be nearly as clear that both the recipient of help (or community partner) and the helper receive benefits from their partnership. That volunteers recognize that they too receive benefits has recently been shown to predict volunteer longevity (Omoto & Snyder, 1995), an important goal of some service-learning programs.

But students' commitment to volunteerism and prosocial activity, over time or even lifelong, may only be one goal of service-learning programs. In our review of the existing research, we examine the many goals that such programs seek to meet, that is, what functions service learning can serve for students, academic institutions, and the greater community.

Functions of Service Learning

For the Student

During their service-learning experience, students may engage in activities that resemble those often performed by "true" volunteers. Our own research, stimulated in part by the functional theories of beliefs and behaviors (e.g., Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956), has examined the needs and goals, plans, and motives that individuals may attempt to satisfy through volunteerism. We have adapted the major themes of the functional approach: people engage in volunteer work to satisfy important social and psychological goals; and individuals may be involved in similar volunteer activities but have different goals. Understanding these varied goals is key to volunteer recruitment and satisfaction; that is, recruitment messages targeted to particular goals will be more persuasive and successful, and, once recruited, individuals will be more satisfied when their volunteer tasks help them meet personal goals. In our work we have identified and explored six major goals, or functions, of volunteerism (Clary & Snyder, 1991, 1999; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al., 1998; Clary, Snyder, Ridge, Miene, & Haugen, 1994; Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998; Snyder, Clary, & Stukas, 2000; Snyder & Omoto, 1992) that may apply equally well to service learning. They are

- self-enhancement
- understanding self and world
- value-expression
- career development
- social expectations
- protection

We use these six functions to organize the following discussion:

Self-enhancement. A recent study found that volunteers saw their activities as a way to boost their own self-esteem, to feel important and needed by others, and to form new friendships (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al., 1998). There is already general consensus that service learning can impact students' personal development in areas such as personal efficacy, self-esteem, and confidence (e.g., Giles & Eyler, 1994a, 1998; Williams, 1991; Yates & Youniss, 1996). It has been found, for example, that cross-age tutoring increased participants' self-esteem (Yogev & Ronen, 1982). Similarly, in another study nearly 60% of youth in service programs agreed that the program showed them that it feels good to help others (Blyth, Saito, & Berkas, 1997).

Most studies, however, demonstrate enhancement-related benefits for only a subset of participants—in other words, student outcomes from service learning are often moderated by significant personal and situational factors. In a study of seventh-graders, for example, it was found that boys experienced increases in self-esteem and school involvement and decreases in depressive affect and problem behavior following a service program, whereas girls did not receive these benefits (Switzer, Simmons, Dew, Regalski, & Wang, 1995). Another study found

the greatest increases in self-esteem for students involved in outdoor programs compared to other experiential programs, suggesting that the intensity and uniqueness of the activities, i.e., their difference from the usual school environment, might account for the results (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982).

Although other program features have not been empirically tested (i.e., most often they are but one element of a complex intervention), certain factors offer perhaps the best avenues for new research on student self-enhancement. According to one researcher, the degree of *responsibility* given to students for selecting and performing tasks at their service site is key to ensuring beneficial outcomes (Shumer, 1997). Similarly, others suggest that the amount of *choice* students have in designing their service experiences is a prominent predictor of satisfaction with a program (Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). It has also been demonstrated that students who reported the most personal benefit in service learning programs were those who indicated that their supervisors had given them *autonomy* (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982). Moreover, students who planned and carried out their service projects *independently* were more likely to report increases in self-efficacy (Blyth et al., 1997). Thus, while service learning can lead to enhancement of student self-esteem and efficacy, it may be those programs that allow students to construct important program features that lead to the greatest enhancement.

Understanding. Another major function of service learning may be to provide students with a greater understanding of the world, the diverse people with whom they work, and, ultimately, themselves. Volunteer activity is seen to highlight new skills and to bring new perspectives (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al., 1998). This may be what students are referring to when they say that service learning has promoted their personal growth. In one investigation, for example, the duration of a community research project was related to self-reported personal growth, with longer-lasting programs leading to greater perceptions of growth (Ferrari & Jason, 1996). Enhanced understanding and personal growth as a result of service learning may owe to an increase in developmental opportunities such as making difficult judgments or being exposed to new ideas that such programs provide (Rutter & Newmann, 1989; see also Brandenberger, 1998; Yates & Youniss, 1996). *Duration* and *intensity* of service programs are held to be key variables in determining the benefits to students (Eyler & Giles, 1997). Indeed, many theorists (e.g., Delve et al., 1990) suggest that students may move through several developmental stages as they serve others en route to receiving social, psychological, and academic benefits—with longer-lasting programs more likely to provide such benefits (Eyler & Giles, 1997).

Students' skills have also been demonstrated to improve—in areas such as moral reasoning (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982), problem-solving (e.g., Eyler, Root, & Giles, 1998) and empathic understanding (Yogev & Ronen, 1982). Again, many of these improvements may be moderated by other personal and situational factors. In one study, for example, instructors who included service in their courses and were seen as allowing students more *autonomy* tended to better promote prosocial reasoning (a cognitive variable that includes self-reflective empathic and internalized reasoning components) in their students. And students' *satisfaction with their relationships with their on-site supervisors* and the quality of the supervision increased general complexity of thought about social issues (Batchelder & Root, 1994). *Collegial attention* from those at the service site can also result in the development of specific task-related skills as well as greater personal growth (e.g., Eyler & Giles, 1997).

Service learning can also influence students' understanding of and attitudes toward diverse groups in society (Blyth et al., 1997; Yates & Youniss, 1996). For example, students who engaged in intergenerational service learning in the context of a course on aging developed more positive attitudes toward the elderly

than students in a social psychology class (Bringle & Kremer, 1993). Service-learning students in another study increased in understanding of international affairs and decreased in racism, compared to students engaged in volunteerism without a learning component or in no service at all (Myers-Lipton, 1996a, 1996b). Still further, experiential education was demonstrated to positively influence adolescents' attitudes toward adults (compared to the attitudes of adolescents in control groups). And attitudes toward the specific community members with whom students interact have been shown to improve positively (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982). Still, not all service-learning initiatives are equally successful. A single-semester social foundations course, designed to give preservice teachers exposure to students from diverse social groups, did not necessarily build democratic character in these teachers, who sometimes reacted against the egalitarian principles they were being led to learn (Vadeboncoeur, Rahm, Aguilera, & LeCompte, 1996).

A major focus of some service-learning programs, especially those that are course content–based, is to improve students' understanding of course material—that is, to increase academic achievement. A handful of studies have found that students' grades were higher when they engaged in service related to a course than when they did not (Markus, Howard, & King, 1993; Reeb, Sammon, & Isackson, 1999; Shumer, 1994). Unfortunately, these studies may present serious analysis problems. Students may self-select into service-learning sections of a course and some researchers argue that service-learning sections are graded more leniently because subjective materials, such as journal entries, are difficult to evaluate (e.g., Kendrick, 1996). Despite these concerns, however, many studies find that student course grades do not differ whether or not a service component is present (Kendrick, 1996; J. Miller, 1995).

Nevertheless, specific course content learning may be enhanced by specific types of programs. One study found, for example, that compared to a waiting-list control group, students who served as interns in political offices increased their knowledge about local government and their positive attitudes toward community participation (though not their positive attitudes toward the local government [Hamilton & Zeldin,1987]). Students engaged in service may also spend more time interacting with faculty members compared to those not engaged in service (e.g., Sax & Astin, 1997; Shumer, 1994) and, perhaps as a result of reflection activities, they may be better able to connect academic concepts to new applied situations (Kendrick, 1996; J. Miller, 1995). It has been suggested that *matching specific service activities to specific course content* will also facilitate student learning (Eyler & Giles, 1997). In other words, it is unlikely that students will be able to integrate course content with their service experience if their service placement does not provide adequate opportunities to observe relevant principles in action. "Serving in a soup kitchen is relevant for a course on social issues but probably not for a course on civil engineering" (Howard, 1998, p. 22).

Learning through service experiences can also be influenced both by the learners' expectations for the experience and whether these expectations are confirmed (Sheckley & Keeton, 1997). Learning of relevant rules, principles, theories, or content can be reinforced by experiences in the community. But learning can also occur as a result of disconfirmatory experiences, which can initiate a reflective process whereby students try to integrate and understand a new and unexpected experience. Such experiences can suggest revisions, expansions, and modifications of preexisting rules, principles, theories, or schemas. We stress that service learning operates through a dynamic, recursive process that includes confirmation and disconfirmation, expectations and reflection (Sheckley & Keeton, 1997).

Assessing the different expectations (and values) that students bring to a service experience and guiding them to explore these expectations in depth is thus a key task for program

coordinators and instructors. Many students may have misconceptions and faulty expectations about the recipients of service (reflecting perhaps a typical pattern of "blame the victim" [Bringle & Velo, 1998]). Disconfirmations of expectations can be managed through active reflection activities or cautions against misattributions (Bringle & Velo, 1998). Although disconfirmations of expectations and assumptions can be unpleasant for students, some research suggests that, despite overly positive expectations that were subsequently disconfirmed, volunteers can continue to be satisfied with their service (e.g., Omoto, Gunn, & Crain, 1998).

Some studies have demonstrated that service learning can enhance students' attitudes toward school in general (e.g., Williams, 1991). Improvements in academic performance and connectedness to school may be most significant for students labeled as "at-risk." In an evaluation of Florida Learn & Serve programs, at-risk students involved in service showed the greatest improvements in attendance, grade-point average, and discipline referrals (Follman & Muldoon, 1997). This finding was based, however, on self-reports from program coordinators—a possibly biased source—who attested to improvements for all students. It is not clear whether the special improvements for at-risk students resulted from their disproportionate deficits prior to the program or whether the program simply had a stronger impact on them. Further research will be necessary to find out.

At least with regard to students' self-report of learning in a service-learning course, one study found that amount learned was significantly affected by the presence of *reflection activities* in a course (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982). These reflection activities also significantly enhanced students' problem-solving skills. In addition, reflection has been identified as an essential factor in producing service-learning benefits (Eyler, 1993). Thus, the reflection component that was strongly integrated with course content may be one reason that course-based service (compared to service not course-based) provided a number of additional benefits to students in another study, including better career preparation, increased skill in conflict resolution, and a greater understanding of social and community problems (in addition to increased frequency of interaction with faculty members [Sax & Astin, 1997]). Similarly, compared to students in courses with service components that are only peripheral to the class, students in courses in which service is central obtained greater benefits in subject-matter learning, personal growth, interpersonal skill, and commitment to the community (Eyler & Giles, 1997).

Some research has shown, in contrast, that the presence of reflection activities, for ninth-grade students in mandatory service-learning programs, did not lead to increases in positive outcomes (Blyth et al., 1997). The *absence of reflection activities*, however, was related to increases in *negative* outcomes such as less socially responsible attitudes, lowered intentions to help in the future, and greater disengagement from school. This finding is difficult to evaluate, however, because the study lacked an adequate comparison group. We note that these negative findings may hold only for required programs wherein the absence of reflection may be particularly critical (e.g., Stukas, Snyder, et al., 1999).

Thus, research suggests that service learning promotes student understanding, but the nature of the understanding depends on the relationship between course content and experience, and the chance to reflect upon that relationship. Instructors' support of student autonomy and a collegial relationship between students and instructors seem to increase the likelihood that students will gain in understanding as a result of service learning.

Value expression. Most volunteers cite the ability to express their humanitarian and prosocial values through action as the predominant function served by volunteerism (e.g., Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al.,1998). Although service-learning participants, especially those required to serve, may be less likely to have previously internalized prosocial values and socially

responsible attitudes than other volunteers (e.g., Olney & Grande, 1995), research suggests that students may increase in these capabilities (and in commitment to service) as a result of organized service-learning programs (e.g., Giles & Eyler, 1994a, 1998). Individuals who engage in service learning or experiential education programs have frequently been demonstrated to show increases in social and personal responsibility (e.g., Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982; Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988; Markus et al., 1993; Sax & Astin, 1997) and altruistic motivation (Yogev & Ronen, 1982). Studies also show that students who engage in service learning indicate that they are likely to continue serving in the future and believe it an important thing to do (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982).

Again, research suggests that these outcomes may be the direct result of service, but such results are likely moderated by other factors. In one study, for example, after a required service-learning program, intentions to help in the future were higher for girls and students with parental helping models, suggesting that gender and parental role modeling may predispose students to benefit from these programs (Stukas, Switzer, Dew, Goycoolea, & Simmons, 1999). The important role of parental helping models in determining children's altruistic motivation has been noted before (e.g., Clary & Miller, 1986; Staub, 1992) and may help to make some students, more than others, receptive to service-learning initiatives. Work on modeling finds a strong gender difference, with girls more responsive to the active socialization attempts of their parents than boys (Staub, 1992) and exhibiting more social responsibility after a service program, though this latter effect did not translate into greater intentions to seek out volunteer work (Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988). These findings are in line with other studies of gender and helping that find (a) girls, more than boys, to have more positive attitudes toward mandatory community service programs (F. Miller, 1994); (b) women medical students participating in volunteer positions to have greater volunteer motivation (Switzer, Switzer, Stukas, & Baker, 1999); and (c) women to be more likely than men to engage in helpful work in general (e.g., Eagly, 1987; Rushton, 1976). Thus, some students (e.g., girls and students with parental helping models) may be more receptive to service programs and, in turn, more likely to demonstrate greater prosocial intentions.

Nevertheless, certain aspects of service-learning programs can enhance prosocial values and intentions for all participants. For example, *collegial treatment* from adults (as reported by students) has been related to increases in social responsibility (Conrad and Hedin, 1981, 1982). And, congruent with other findings on *autonomy* (Deci & Flaste, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 1987), it has been found that required programs led to increased intentions to volunteer only for students who did *not* perceive that they were being controlled by the requirement (Stukas, Snyder, et al., 1999). This finding suggests that providing greater freedom to students to choose their service activities and related program features might attenuate some of the negative impact of requiring participation.

Children induced to make a *private commitment* to help others may be more likely to develop altruistic self-attributions than children induced to make a public commitment (Cialdini, Eisenberg, Shell, & McCreath, 1987). Thus, deciding to engage in prosocial behavior by oneself, without pressure to maintain a consistent public image, can lead to greater internalization of a prosocial self-image. This finding that a private commitment can be beneficial does not mean, however, that students must design and engage in service projects alone. In one study, students who worked in groups to plan and carry out required service projects were more likely to show increases in social responsibility and intentions to continue helping than students who were not involved in planning or who served alone (Blyth et al., 1997). This again suggests that some degree of responsibility for planning service, and especially, perhaps, when this involves working together with others, can

lead to greater benefits—with the absence of such responsibility possibly resulting in negative outcomes, particularly in required programs.

The failure of service learning to translate into increased intentions to serve in all students may also be explained by how we measure those intentions. New research suggests that in our attempt to predict commitment, it may be a mistake to try to predict general volunteer activity from more specific types of service. That is, students may develop a role identity (e.g., Red Cross volunteer) related to the organization for which they work rather than a more general altruistic self-conception (e.g., volunteer), and it is this specific role identity that may best predict other volunteer activities (Grube & Piliavin, in press). Such research is an extension of earlier studies demonstrating that repeated experiences as a blood donor could lead to a "role-person merger," in which a helpful role becomes a salient part of a person's identity and, thus, a good predictor of future behavior (e.g., Callero, Howard, & Piliavin, 1987; Charng, Piliavin, & Callero, 1988). It has been demonstrated that specific role identity, in turn, can be predicted by (a) the importance of the role the volunteer feels they play for the organization, (b) the prestige of the organization, (c) congruence between the values of the organization and those of the volunteer, and (d) the social network the volunteer develops at the organization. To enhance commitment, those who create service programs may want to consider the match between student and the type of organization they serve (Grube & Piliavin, in press).

Quality of the service experience is thus an important predictor of students' increased sense of social responsibility. Its elements include "having important responsibilities, challenging tasks, varied tasks, acting rather than observing, and having one's opinions challenged" (Eyler & Giles, 1997, p. 70)—that is, giving students autonomy and the latitude to develop and control their own service activities (along with the kinds of developmental opportunities mentioned by Rutter & Newmann, 1989). In addition, the specific type of activity is also an important determinant of outcomes. For example, adolescents engaged in community involvement projects increased in social responsibility and intentions to further volunteer more than adolescents engaged in child care programs, although participants rated both programs as equally satisfying (Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988). Although the explanation for this result is unclear, the finding indicates that some activities may be more conducive than others.

Thus, service learning has been shown to enhance social responsibility and prosocial intentions. Best results are linked to student autonomy, close respectful relationships between students and instructors, and matching of tasks with student needs and interests.

Career development. Research has shown that volunteers, especially younger volunteers, were likely to see their good works as a way to explore career options and to increase the likelihood that they might be able to pursue the career they want (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al., 1998). Service-learning activities tied to course curriculum provide the clearest example of how volunteerism can allow students to explore their career options and lead them to begin planning careers in earnest (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982; Sax & Astin, 1997). One study found that student volunteer work predicted intrinsic work values, importance of career, and importance of community involvement, even when factors related to self-selection into service were taken into account (Johnson et al., 1998). Moreover, the students who engaged in service actually became less concerned with their own career compared with the greater social and altruistic aspects of their potential work lives. Other studies have reported mixed results with regard to changing career goals and development as a function of service learning (e.g., Williams, 1991).

Clearly, although little work has explicitly examined student career development as an outcome of service learning, it appears that opportunities and activities offered by service that relate to students' career interests (and, presum-

ably, the course content at hand) would best allow students to determine how well a particular career suits them. Ideally, specific skills that advance students toward their career of choice could also be learned in this way. We should not expect, however, that service alone, if unrelated to student career interests, will advance career development.

Social expectations. It has also been found that individuals volunteer to satisfy the expectations of friends and close others (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al., 1998). By volunteering, individuals may uphold the prosocial values of the social groups to which they belong. The very presence of curricular service-learning options and requirements, for example, can signal the importance of prosocial activity to the student's academic institution. Thus, students may feel that service learning allows them to meet the expectations of their institution as well as, perhaps, those of their family and friends. Volunteer activity and longevity have been shown to be influenced by the social expectations of those around the volunteer—if many others in your social network are volunteering, you are more likely to do so as well (Grube & Piliavin, in press). Adult graduates of a high school program that involved service were more likely to volunteer after graduation if they reported that friends and family members were also volunteers (Yates & Youniss, 1998). In addition, the finding that children with parental helping models were more likely to report increases in volunteer intentions after a service program is in line with the notion that those in our social networks, especially very close others, may influence us to volunteer (Stukas, Switzer, et al., 1999).

Thus, students may volunteer in order to uphold the values and expectations of their important reference groups (family, peers, community leaders, institutions), although, again, research on the effects of social expectations on the outcomes of service learning is sparse. The repeated finding that collegial relationships between students and instructors increases beneficial outcomes (e.g., Eyler & Giles, 1997) may, in fact, be mediated by the increase in importance of the expectations of these instructors for students (an hypothesis that has yet to be tested). The closeness of the relationships between those served and those serving may also be an influence on positive outcomes for all concerned (e.g., Omoto et al., 1998).

Protection. Volunteer activity can provide individuals with a distraction from personal problems and perhaps an opportunity to work through problems in the context of their service (e.g., Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al.,1998). As such, service-learning activities can "protect" students from stress in their lives. Consistent with this notion, engaging students in community service can reduce feelings of alienation and isolation (Calabrese & Schumer, 1986). Research has also shown that engaging in service can reduce disciplinary problems (Calabrese & Schumer, 1986; Follman & Muldoon, 1997). Similarly, community-based learning programs can increase student attendance rates (perhaps especially for students who initially have attendance problems [Shumer, 1994]). Many of the moderating variables that ensure positive student outcomes in other areas could also help to ensure these protective benefits. For example, it may be the amount of responsibility given to adolescents, and the related invitation to the world of adults, that reduces feelings of alienation (Calabrese & Schumer, 1986).

The fact that some benefits of service learning are most strongly achieved by students labeled "at risk" (e.g., Follman & Muldoon, 1997) may be testament to the protective effects of service experiences. Although there is little if any research that directly tests such notions, it seems likely that students with negative self-conceptions may see community service activities as a way to salvage their self-image through other-focused helpful activities. And such outcomes seem more likely to the extent that students themselves initiate or design them.

Matching person and situation. A central premise of the functional approach to volunteerism (e.g., Clary & Snyder, 1991, 1999;

Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al.,1998; Snyder et al., 2000) is that different volunteers may engage in the same activities for very different reasons. Understanding these reasons is the key to promoting commitment and satisfaction among volunteers. To that end, we designed and validated the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI) to assess six major functions that volunteerism can serve for individuals. This instrument has been used in several studies which found that students whose chief goals for service were met by their program activities were more likely to be satisfied with the program and more likely to intend to volunteer in the future (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al., 1998). Thus, for example, students who sought a greater understanding of diverse peoples and situations—and who had that need met by their service—were more likely to intend to volunteer later on than students whose need went unmet. Another study showed that students who felt that their specific activities were interesting and that they provided personal benefits were likely to be satisfied by their service program (Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982). Although this finding may be unsurprising, it is nevertheless important to keep in mind that students enter service programs with a variety of backgrounds, interests, and personal characteristics and the fit between their characteristics and service experiences can significantly affect their subsequent satisfaction, activity, and other outcomes (Waterman, 1997). (A majority of students may concur, however, on which goals are most important; one recent study found that students were most likely to rate value expression and understanding as their primary goals [as rated on the VFI], whereas social and protective motives were rated as least important [Chapman & Morley, 1999]).

This focus on the goals and needs of students and their satisfaction through service helps enhance our understanding of who benefits from service learning. Indeed, a match between student and organizational values is important to predicting specific role identity (Grube & Piliavin, in press). This is a familiar point made by service-learning professionals: "It is the way in which the particular program interacts with the needs and experiences of each participant that determines the program's impact" (Hamilton & Fenzel, 1988, p. 79). This entire discussion may remind readers of earlier theorizing on the principle of interaction (Dewey, 1938), a theoretical basis for service learning (e.g., Carver, 1997; Giles & Eyler, 1994b), which suggests that educational and social development occurs as a result of both the student and his or her environment.

To summarize, service-learning benefits to students fall loosely into the six functions established by research on the Volunteer Functions Inventory: enhancement, understanding, values, career, social and protective functions (Clary, Snyder, Ridge, et al., 1998). And, as indicated by our review of the literature, such benefits may be moderated by factors that include the support of autonomy for students, the development of a collegial relationship between students and instructors, the presence of reflection activities, and the match between students' (and instructors') goals and the specific activities in which students engage.

For the Institution

Although service learning as a broadly defined concept has steadily gained acceptance on U.S. campuses, controversy persists surrounding its inclusion in the curriculum. Several potential weaknesses of the experiential approach have been identified. It may be less efficient in presenting information and risks the possibility that students will miss the connections between theory and experience (Conrad & Hedin, 1991). The new pedagogy of academic service learning may conflict with "traditional pedagogy" over what students should learn and how much control the instructor should wield (Howard, 1998). Clearly, an instructor who incorporates a service component in a course must make difficult decisions that cut to the heart of educational theory—and other educators may find such decisions unpalatable.

Indeed, with regard to *required* service programs in particular, concerns about exploitation of students and possible legal and political opposition can be added to the list of controversies (e.g., Furco, 1994; Sobus, 1995).

Nevertheless, one way to minimize confusion and controversy is to clarify the goals and motivations that a particular institution (or department, course, etc.) has for putting service into its curriculum (Cohen, 1994; see also Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Furco, 1994). For students, faculty, boards of trustees, legislatures, etc., this clarification may go a long way toward resolving concerns—or at least making clear where points of contention lie. Indeed, the goals that institutions have for including community service either as a requirement or as an elective may vary, hence the need for clarification.

In the following section we discuss some of the institutional motives and agendas for service learning. As psychologists we tend to focus on individual volunteer-related motives and agendas. But given that institutions reflect both individual and group agendas, we propose to apply this same framework to groups (and larger entities) by analogy. Unfortunately, empirical research and psychological theory on institutional motives is quite sparse.

Value expression. It has been suggested that the goals of an academic institution that incorporates service-learning programs should be "to be a responsible presence in the community, to educate its students to be good citizens, and to help solve the pressing social problems of our day" (Price & Martello, 1996, p. 15). It may be an inherent part of the contract between public academic institutions and the communities in which they reside that students be prepared for civic and social responsibilities (e.g., Lisman, 1998; Rhoads, 1998; Ward, 1997). In fact, society as a whole may have a vested interest in making certain that prosocial values are transmitted to the next generation (e.g., Clary, Snyder, & Stukas, 1998). Service learning may be one way to assure that these goals are met.

Understanding. It is also suggested that the goals of internships and field experience programs are primarily to enhance student learning—certainly a central goal of academic institutions (Price & Martello, 1996). But such programs (and service-learning programs in general) may also help institutions themselves become better attuned to the needs of the community and their role in it. An important goal of institutions of higher education in the new millenium should be to teach "socially responsive knowledge," with service-learning courses having three aims: "first, to educate students in the problems of society; second, have them experience and understand first-hand social issues in their community; and third, and most importantly, give students the experience and skills to act on social problems" (Altman, 1996, pp. 374-375). Naturally, such attention to teaching socially responsive knowledge will require institutions to gain a better understanding of social problems and how to address them. In this way, an institution's dedication to scholarship is also advanced.

Career development. Institutional goals for co-operative education programs tend to center on fostering students' career development and job readiness skills (Price & Martello, 1996). This may also be a central goal of many content-based service-learning courses, which allow students a chance to connect with discipline-based activities in the natural environment. Indeed, it may be the extent to which service-learning components lead to explicit discipline-related skills that make such components most appealing to academic administrators, rather than the "goodness" inherent in service-work alone (Cohen, 1994). Yet, if we think about an institution's "career," we can also see that introducing service into the curriculum has the potential to cement connections with the community. These connections may lead to increased enrollment, placement of graduating students into positions in the community, and possibly contributions or grants from supportive community organizations and individuals (e.g., Driscoll et al., 1996).

Certainly, such benefits stand to advance the "career" of the institution in question.

Enhancement and protection. Potential benefits to institutions that commit to service learning include both a higher profile in the community and a more positive image locally and perhaps in a broader community (Driscoll et al., 1996). Such a positive image can also advance and make more possible other important goals of the institution, such as fundraising, enrollment, grants, and contracts, etc.. Incorporation of service learning can also serve to protect institutions from negative public impressions. In one study, for example, the service program was required only for business students, a group whose prosocial motivation is frequently questioned (Stukas, Snyder et al., 1999).

Social expectations. Without stretching the comparison of institutional and human motives too far, we point out, finally, that institutions may themselves feel pressed to put service learning into the curriculum—either by the immediate community or by organizations such as Campus Compact, accreditation boards, etc. Pressure comes also from state and federal governments through financial incentives offered to institutions that make such commitments.

We stress that different institutions, like individuals, may have different goals. But clarity of an institution's goals allows for assessment and, in turn, better program design and initiatives to reach those goals.

For the Community

Society at large, like individuals and institutions, also has needs and goals that can be met through the promotion of service-learning educational programs. Here we focus on the recipients of the helpfulness of service-learning participants, and, again, we take a psychological perspective.

Much of the research on service learning has focused on benefits to student participants—to the neglect of the "shared understanding" and "common good" that can come through dialogue between "service partners." Students and the community members whom they serve need to come together to reflect on the experience rather than having students engage in reflection independently. Only then can service improve the community and create positive change in student attitudes toward those served (Kraft, 1996). Emphasis is thus on empowerment of the community member as well as the student. This may be of even greater importance when student volunteers and community members come from different levels of social power or status in society (e.g., Ward, 1997). Programs that take such a perspective and studies that assess the recipient of help, in addition to the student helper, appear few and far between.

Research on the effects of helping on those who receive help typically focuses on recipient self-esteem and self-perceptions rather than on any objective measures of benefits (e.g., Lenrow, 1978; Nadler & Fisher, 1986; Stein, 1989). It could be, for instance, that recipients, reminded of their place in society and their "neediness," feel worse rather than better after their encounters with students engaged in service learning (e.g., Stein, 1989). And this could be intensified when those serving and those served occupy different social strata, as is the case of most "multicultural" service-learning programs (e.g., Dunlap, 1998; Ward, 1997); although it has been suggested that help from individuals of the same social level may be even more stressful for recipients because of the implied social comparison (Nadler & Fisher, 1986). One way to make receiving help more palatable for recipients may be to give them some control over the help they receive, for example, over when, where, and how it takes place (Nadler & Fisher, 1986). This suggestion echoes the findings we presented earlier on the importance of perceived control and autonomy-support (e.g., Conrad & Hedin, 1981, 1982) and fits well with the notion of community partner empowerment (Kraft, 1996). In the absence of such empowerment of the partners, students who expect to meet with expressions of gratitude may be disappointed,

and this quite natural state of affairs could instead reinforce preexisting stereotypes about those in need (e.g., Stein, 1989). Students in service-learning programs must be well prepared in advance for what to expect from their work in the community, including a range of responses from community members (Sheckley & Keeton, 1997).

It might seem ironic to ask whether students involved in community service learning do indeed provide valuable service—but it is not always the case that they do. Only by assessing community needs and satisfaction with service can we learn about the benefits to both students and recipients. Unfortunately, most studies of service learning focus on the former, whereas mention of recipient outcomes is usually only theoretical or anecdotal. Descriptions of services provided, from an analysis by one set of researchers (Price & Martello, 1996) include those of vital value (e.g., food, shelter, comfort, or protection), social value (e.g., support for relevant systems and organizations), cultural value (e.g., addressing artistic, ideological, and political concerns), and personal value (e.g., enhancing recipients' awareness and understanding).

Rarely do studies take account of the mutuality of benefits to students and community partners. Studies have shown, however, that tutoring increases recipient learning (Hedin, 1987), and peer-counseling reduces recipient drug use (Black, Tobler, & Sciacca, 1998)—at the same time that the tutors and counselors benefit (Conrad & Hedin, 1991). And service-learning programs can also change the way community members view teenagers (Fertman, 1996). Both students and recipients can appreciate the reciprocal nature of their relationship and can identify benefits that accrue to helpers and recipients (Greene, 1998; Greene & Diehm, 1995). In a longitudinal study of the relationship between AIDS volunteers and Persons With AIDS (PWAs), the satisfaction of volunteers and the perceived quality of the relationship increased with the closeness of the relationship between the two "buddies" (Omoto et al., 1998). Presumably, degree of closeness (that is, frequency and variety of activities performed together, and strength of mutual influence) also relates to the benefit and satisfaction of PWAs as well. Investigations of the reciprocal relationship between those who help and those who receive help are rare, but given these promising findings, more research is much needed (see Lenrow, 1978, for an analysis of the dilemmas faced by those in helping roles).

Neglect of community outcomes may be diminishing, however. A model has been proposed to account for the goals and benefits for four constituencies (Driscoll et al., 1996): students, faculty, institution, and community. Strikingly, researchers and members of each constituency have worked in collaboration—an exemplary process—to develop an assessment plan. Until such studies are completed, though, our understanding of service-learning effects on the community remains limited. The model predicts a range of community outcomes (Driscoll et al., 1996): improved health and welfare of all citizens (serving the functions of value expression and career development); new connections and networks among students, faculty, the institution, and community members (social, understanding); new insights into community and institutional organization and activities (understanding); creation of a pool of potential employees that are already knowledgeable about community concerns and structures (career, understanding, social, values); promotion of more positive relationships between community organizations, institutions, and their constituents (enhancement, social); and more (e.g., Driscoll et al., 1996).

Conclusions

Service-learning programs have the potential to serve diverse functions. They make possible, for all constituents—students, institutions, and recipients:

- the *enhancement* of public and private images and self-concepts,
- a greater *understanding* of the world and its citizens,
- the expression and fulfillment of humanitarian and altruistic *values*,
- the strengthened purpose and skills that can lead to a *career*,
- the fulfillment of *social* expectations, and
- *protection* from negative life stresses.

But we maintain that none of these benefits is guaranteed, for to be effective, service-learning programs must embody certain characteristics. We conclude, based on the research evidence, the following:

(1) Programs should be *autonomy-supportive*. That is, they should allow students and community partners and other interested parties a voice in determining the details of service activities. Programs that limit choice, remove autonomy, or exert too much control may end in harming more than helping. Supporting autonomy aligns with research showing that an "authoritative" parenting style (as opposed to an overcontrolling "authoritarian" or too liberal "permissive" style) best fosters children's competency. Authoritative parents provide limits within which children choose their own actions (e.g., Baumrind, 1968, 1989). Similarly, service programs that suggest, but do not dictate, opportunities may promote the most positive outcomes.

(2) Programs should be designed to accentuate the *matching of goals and activities*. To this end, student interests and needs should help shape activities, and institutional goals should be reflected in the types of activities offered. As suggested by the functional theories (e.g., Katz, 1960; Smith et al., 1956), such matching should assure the achievement of goals (both personal and institutional) and greater satisfaction of all concerned.

(3) Programs must attend to the *relationships* among all participants. Care must be taken to establish respectful, collegial, and mutually fulfilling relationships between instructors and students and between students and community partners. Research has suggested that such relationships with adult role models can lead children to greater commitment to helping behavior throughout life (e.g., Clary & Miller, 1986; Oliner & Oliner, 1988; Rosenhan, 1970). Service programs that attend to and foster positive relationships between site supervisors and students may have far-reaching and long-lasting benefits.

(4) For optimal effectiveness, programs must provide opportunities for *reflection*—without which chances for learning are reduced. Reflection activities serve to cement the link between experience and theory—and without such activities, service may provide benefits (if the above conditions are met), but learning may not be among them. The logic here comes directly from Dewey (1933), who proposed that experience could be educative to the extent that reflective thinking is elicited from the student (e.g., Giles & Eyler, 1994b). We could argue, therefore, that without reflection none of the benefits discussed is possible—which is, of course, an empirical question.

Finally, we offer one more suggestion: that evaluations be carefully constructed to assess the effects of service learning for all involved—with an emphasis on rigorous experimental and survey methodology. More research is needed to determine the multiple factors that best predict the achievement of goals and satisfaction of all, the students, institutions, recipients and society at large.

References

Alt, M. N. (1997). How effective an educational tool is student community service? *Nassp Bulletin, 81,* 8–16.

Altman, I. (1996). Higher education and psychology in the millennium. *American Psychologist, 51,* 371–378.

Batchelder, T. H., & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17,* 341–355.

Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. authoritative parental control. *Adolescence, 3,* 255–272.

Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349–378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Black, D. R., Tobler, N. S., & Sciacca, J. P. (1998). Peer helping/involvement: An efficacious way to meet the challenge of reducing alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use among youth? *Journal of School Health, 68,* 87–93.

Blyth, D. A., Saito, R., & Berkas, T. (1997). A quantitative study of the impact of service-learning programs. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-learning: Applications from the research* (pp. 39–56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brandenberger, J. W. (1998). Developmental psychology and service-learning: A theoretical framework. In R. G. Bringle & D. K. Duffy (Eds.), *With service in mind: Concepts and models for service-learning in psychology* (pp. 68–84). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Bringle, R. G., & Kremer, J. F. (1993). Evaluation of an intergenerational service-learning project for undergraduates. *Educational Gerontology, 19,* 407–416.

Bringle, R. G., & Velo, P. M. (1998). Attributions about misery: A social psychological analysis. In R. G. Bringle & D. K. Duffy (Eds.), *With service in mind: Concepts and models for service-learning in psychology* (pp. 51–67). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Calabrese, R. L., & Schumer, H. (1986). The effects of service activities on adolescent alienation. *Adolescence, 21,* 675–687.

Callero, P. L., Howard, J. A., & Piliavin, J. A. (1987). Helping behavior as role behavior: Disclosing social structure and history in the analysis of prosocial action. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50,* 247–256.

Carver, R. L. (1997). Theoretical underpinnings of service learning. *Theory into Practice, 36,* 143–149.

Chapman, J. G., & Morley, R. (1999). Collegiate service-learning: Motives underlying volunteerism and satisfaction with volunteer service. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*(1/2), 19–33.

Charng, H., Piliavin, J. A., & Callero, P. L. (1988). Role identity and reasoned action in the prediction of repeated behavior. *Social Psychological Quarterly, 51,* 303–317.

Cialdini, R. B., Eisenberg, N., Shell, R., & McCreath, H. (1987). Commitments to help by children: Effects on subsequent prosocial self-attributions. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 26,* 237–245.

Clary, E. G., & Miller, J. (1986). Socialization and situational influences on sustained altruism. *Child Development, 57,* 1358–1369.

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Prosocial behavior* (pp. 119–148). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8,* 156–159.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 1516–1530.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Miene, P., & Haugen, J. (1994). Matching messages to motives in persuasion: A functional approach to promoting volunteerism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24,* 1129–1149.

Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., & Stukas, A. A. (1998). Service-learning and psychology: Lessons from the psychology of volunteers' motivations. In R. G. Bringle & D. K. Duffy (Eds.), *With service in*

mind: Concepts and models for service-learning in psychology (pp. 35–50). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Cohen, J. (1994). Matching university mission with service motivation: Do the accomplishments of community service match the claims? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1*, 98–104.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1981). National assessment of experiential education: Summary and implications. *Journal of Experiential Education, 4*, 6–20.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1982). The impact of experiential education on adolescent development. *Child and Youth Services, 4*, 57–76.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1991). School-based community service: What we know from research and theory. *Phi Delta Kappan, 72*, 743–749.

Deci, E. L., & Flaste, R. (1995). *Why we do what we do: The dynamics of personal autonomy*. New York: Putnam.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 1024–1037.

Delve, C. I., Mintz, S. D., & Stewart, G. M. (1990). Promoting values development through community service: A design. *New Directions for Student Services, 50*, 7–29.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Boston: Heath.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institution. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3*, 66–71.

Dunlap, M. R. (1998). Voices of students in multicultural service-learning settings. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 5*, 58–67.

Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eyler, J. (1993). Comparing the impact of two internship experiences on student learning. *Journal of Cooperative Education, 29*, 41–52.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D., Jr. (1997). The importance of program quality in service-learning. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-learning: Applications from the research* (pp. 57–76). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eyler, J., Root, S., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1998). Service-learning and the development of expert citizens: Service-learning and cognitive science. In R. G. Bringle & D. K. Duffy (Eds.), *With service in mind: Concepts and models for service-learning in psychology* (pp. 85–100). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Ferrari, J. R., & Jason, L. A. (1996). Integrating research and community service: Incorporating research skills into service learning experiences. *College Student Journal, 30*, 444–451.

Fertman, C. I. (1996). Linking learning and service: Lessons from service learning programs in Pennsylvania. *ERS Spectrum, 14*, 9–16.

Finney, M. R. (1997). Service learning in Maryland: Making academics more relevant. *Nassp Bulletin, 81*, 37–44.

Follman, J., & Muldoon, K. (1997). Florida learn & serve 1995-96: What were the outcomes? *Nassp Bulletin, 81*, 29–36.

Furco, A. (1994). A conceptual framework for the institutionalization of youth service programs in primary and secondary education. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 395–409.

Giles, D. E., Jr., & Eyler, J. (1994a). The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 327–339.

Giles, D. E., Jr., & Eyler, J. (1994b). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Towards a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 1*, 77–85.

Giles, D. E., Jr., & Eyler, J. (1998). A service learning research agenda for the next five years. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 73*, 65–72.

Greene, D. (1998). Reciprocity in two conditions of service-learning. *Educational Gerontology, 24*, 411–424.

Greene, D., & Diehm, G. (1995). Educational and service outcomes of a service integration effort. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2*, 54–62.

Grube, J. A., & Piliavin, J. A. (in press). Role identity, organizational experiences, and volunteer performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Hamilton, S. F., & Fenzel, L. M. (1988). The impact of volunteer experience on adolescent social

development: Evidence of program effects. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 3,* 65–80.

Hamilton, S. F., & Zeldin, R. S. (1987). Learning civics in the community. *Curriculum Inquiry, 17,* 407–420.

Hatcher, J. A., & Bringle, R. G. (1997). Reflection: Bridging the gap between service and learning. *College Teaching, 45,* 153–158.

Hedin, D. (1987). Students as teachers: A tool for improving school climate and productivity. *Social Policy, 17,* 42–47.

Hepburn, M. A. (1997). Service learning in civic education: A concept with long, sturdy roots. *Theory Into Practice, 36,* 136–142.

Howard, J. P. F. (1998). Academic service learning: A counternormative pedagogy. *New_Directions for Teaching and Learning, 73,* 21–29.

Johnson, M. K., Beebe, T., Mortimer, J. T., & Snyder, M. (1998). Volunteerism in adolescence: A process perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8,* 309–332.

Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24,* 163–204.

Kendall, J. C. and Associates (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service.* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.

Kendrick, J. R., Jr. (1996). Outcomes of service-learning in an introduction to sociology course. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3,* 72–81.

Kraft, R. J. (1996). Service learning: An introduction to its theory, practice, and effects. *Education and Urban Society, 28,* 131–159.

Kraft, R. J., & Krug, J. (1994). Review of research and evaluation on service learning in public and higher education. In R. J. Kraft & M. Swadener (Eds.), *Building community: Service learning in the academic disciplines* (pp. 199–213). Denver, CO: Colorado Campus Compact.

Lenrow, P. B. (1978). The work of helping strangers. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 6,* 555–571.

Lisman, C. D. (1998). *Toward a civil society: Civic literacy and service learning.* Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Markus, G. B., Howard, J., & King, D. C. (1993). Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15,* 410–419.

Miller, F. (1994). Gender differences in adolescents' attitudes toward mandatory community service. *Journal of Adolescence, 17,* 381–393.

Miller, J. (1994). Linking traditional and service-learning courses: Outcome evaluations utilizing two pedagogically distinct models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 1,* 29–36.

Myers-Lipton, S. J. (1996a). Effect of service-learning on college students' attitudes toward international understanding. *Journal of College Student Development, 37,* 659–668.

Myers-Lipton, S. J. (1996b). Effect of a comprehensive service-learning program on college students' level of modern racism. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 3,* 44–54.

Nadler, A., & Fisher, J. (1986). The role of threat to self-esteem and perceived control in recipient reaction to help: Theory development and empirical validation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 19, pp. 81–122). New York: Academic Press.

O'Keefe, J. M. (1997). Children and community service: Character education in action. *Journal of Education, 179,* 47–62.

Oliner, S., & Oliner, P. (1988). *The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe.* New York: Free Press.

Olney, C., & Grande, S. (1995). Validation of a scale to measure development of social responsibility. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 2,* 43–53.

Omoto, A. M., Gunn, D. O., & Crain, A. L. (1998). Helping in hard times: Relationship closeness and the AIDS volunteer experience. In V. J. Derlega & A. P. Barbee (Eds.), *HIV & social interaction* (pp. 106–128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 671–686.

Price, J. R., III, & Martello, J. S. (1996). Naming and framing service learning: A taxonomy and four levels of value. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum, 7,* 11–23.

Reeb, R. N., Sammon, J. A., & Isackson, N. L.

(1999). Clinical application of the service-learning model in psychology: Evidence of educational and clinical benefits. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*(1/2), 65–82.

Rhoads, Robert A. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rhoads, Robert A. (1998). In the service of citizenship: A study of student involvement in community service. *Journal of Higher Education, 69*, 277–297.

Rosenhan, D. (1970). The natural socialization of altruistic autonomy. In J. Macauley & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), *Altruism and helping behavior* (pp. 251–268). New York: Academic Press.

Rushton, J. P. (1976). Socialization and the altruistic behavior of children. *Psychological Bulletin, 83*, 898–913.

Rutter, R. A., & Newmann, F. M. (1989). The potential of community service to enhance civic responsibility. *Social Education, 53*, 371–374.

Sax, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (1997). The benefits of service: Evidence from undergraduates. *Educational Record, 78*, 25–32.

Serow, R. C. (1997). Research and evaluation on service-learning: The case for holistic assessment. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-learning: Applications from the research* (pp. 13–24). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sheckley, B. G., & Keeton, M. T. (1997). Service learning: A theoretical model. In J. Schine (Ed.), *Service learning: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 32–55). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Shumer, R. (1994). Community-based learning: Humanizing education. *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 357–367.

Shumer, R. (1997). What research tells us about designing service learning programs. *Nassp Bulletin, 81*, 18–24.

Shumer, R., & Belbas, B. (1996). What we know about service learning. *Education and Urban Society, 28*, 208–223.

Smith, M. B., Bruner, J., & White, R. (1956). *Opinions and personality.* New York: John Wiley.

Snyder, M., Clary, E. G., & Stukas, A. A. (2000). The functional approach to volunteerism. In G. R. Maio & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *Why we evaluate: Functions of attitudes* (pp. 365–393). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (1992). Who helps and why? The psychology of AIDS volunteerism. In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Helping and being helped: Naturalistic studies* (pp. 213–239). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sobus, M. S. (1995). Mandating community service: Psychological implications of requiring prosocial behavior. *Law and Psychology Review, 19*, 153–182.

Stanton, T. K., Giles, D. E., Jr., & Cruz, N. I. (1999). *Service-learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Staub, E. (1992). The origins of caring, helping, and nonaggression. Parental socialization, the family system, schools, and cultural influence. In P. M. Oliner, S. P. Oliner, L. Baron, L. A. Blum, D. L. Krebs, & M. Z. Smolenska (Eds.), *Embracing the other: Philosophical, psychological, and historical perspectives on altruism* (pp. 390–412). New York: New York University Press.

Stein, M. (1989). Gratitude and attitude: A note on emotional welfare. *Social Psychological Quarterly, 52*, 242–248.

Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of "mandatory volunteerism" on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science, 10*(1), 59–64.

Stukas, A. A., Switzer, G. E., Dew, M. A., Goycoolea, J. M., & Simmons, R. G. (1999). Parental helping models, gender, and service-learning. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*(1/2), 5–18.

Switzer, C. L., Switzer, G. E., Stukas, A. A., & Baker, C. E. (1999). Medical students' motivations to volunteer. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 18*(1/2), 53–64.

Switzer, G. E., Simmons, R. G., Dew, M. A., Regalski, J. M., & Wang, C. (1995). The effect of a school-based helper program on adolescent self-image, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 15*, 429–455.

Vadeboncoeur, J. A., Rahm, J., Aguilera, D., & LeCompte, M. D. (1996). Building democratic character through community experiences in teacher education. *Education and Urban Society, 28*, 189–207.

Ward, J. V. (1997). Encouraging cultural competence in service learning practice. In J. Schine (Ed.), *Service learning. Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 136–148). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Waterman, A. S. (1997). The role of student characteristics in service-learning. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-learning: Applications from the research* (pp. 95–105). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Williams, R. (1991). The impact of field education on student development: Research findings. *Journal of Cooperative Education, 27*, 29–45.

Yates, M. (1999). Community service and political-moral discussions among adolescents: A study of a mandatory school-based program in the United States. In M. Yates & J. Youniss (Eds.), *Roots of civic identity: International perspectives on community service and activism in youth* (pp. 16–31). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1996). A developmental perspective on community service in adolescence. Social Development, 5, 85–111.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1998). Community service and political identity development in adolescence. Journal of Social Issues, 54, 495–512.

Yogev, A., & Ronen, R. (1982). Cross-age tutoring: Effects on tutors' attributes. Journal of Educational Research, 75, 261–268.

About the Authors

Arthur A. Stukas, Jr., Ph.D., is assistant professor of psychology at the University of Northern Colorado. His research interests include the personal and situational factors that underlie value-expression and goal-directed behavior, including such varied behaviors as volunteerism, organ and tissue donation, principled stands against prejudice, and active disconfirmation of erroneous interpersonal expectations.

E. Gil Clary, Ph.D., is professor of psychology at the College of St. Catherine. In addition to his research on volunteers' motivations for engaging in volunteer activities, he is exploring some of the questions and issues facing the larger nonprofit sector. Clary is also engaged in conceptual and empirical research on long-term helpers' orientations, models, or philosophies of helping, and their impact on helping interactions and outcomes.

Mark Snyder, Ph.D., is professor of psychology and director of the Social Psychology Program at the University of Minnesota, where he has been a member of the faculty since 1972. His research interests include theoretical and empirical issues associated with the motivational foundations of individual and collective behavior, and the applications of basic theory and research in personality and social psychology to addressing practical problems confronting society. He has served as president of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. He is also the author of the book, *Public Appearances/Private Realities: The Psychology of Self-Monitoring*.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by grants from the Gannett Foundation and the Aspen Institute's Nonprofit Research Fund to Mark Snyder and Gil Clary, and by grants from the National Science Foundation and National Institute of Mental Health to Mark Snyder.

BRIEF

Federally Funded Community Service Programs

Editor

The federal government funds a wide array of community service and volunteer programs through two statutes: the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (NCSA) and the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (DVSA). The authorization of NCSA and DVSA expired in 1996, but both continue to be funded through annual appropriations legislation.

The programs subsumed under NCSA and DVSA recruit and serve a broad range of participants, from school-age youth to the elderly. Most relevant to this *Social Policy Report* are those programs that involve students and youth in community service: the AmeriCorps Grants, the National Civilian Community Corps, Learn and Serve America, and VISTA.

AmeriCorps Grants. In 1996–97, 21,628 individuals participated in AmeriCorps; of these, some 15,000 were aged 17 to 30. AmeriCorp's purpose is to directly address community needs in the areas of education, public safety, human services, and the environment, with emphasis on service to children and youth. Participants receive a living allowance and are eligible for education awards. The FY 2000 appropriation for AmeriCorps is $234 million.

National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC). In 1996–97, 1,027 young adults, ages 18 to 24, took part in NCCC, a ten-month residential program which addresses local community needs. Campuses are located in five regions: Northeastern, Capital (near Washington, D.C.), Southeastern, Central, and Western. Participants receive an annual stipend of $4,000 and are eligible for educational awards. In FY 2000 the appropriation for NCCC is $18 million.

Learn and Serve America. This program, authorized since 1990, is designed to benefit both students and the community. Approximately 824,000 individuals participated in 1999. Grants are awarded in three areas, to (1) school-based programs to involve elementary and secondary school students in community service connected with school curriculum; (2) community groups to involve school children and youth in community projects; and (3) institutions of higher education to provide opportunities for college-age students to take part in community service that, again, is integrated with course curricula. The FY 2000 appropriation for Learn and Serve America is $43 million.

Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA). VISTA, the longest-standing of these programs, was authorized in 1965 to encourage volunteers to reside in poverty areas and assist in poverty-related projects. The volunteer's role is to help communities mobilize their own resources in the service of addressing community problems. In 1996–97, 4,248 individuals participated; of these nearly half were aged 18 to 27. The annual living allowance in 1999 was $8,730, and participants are eligible for an education award or a $1,200 stipend at the end of service. The FY 2000 appropriation is $81 million.

National Service Trust. This trust provides funding for the education awards received by individuals participating in AmeriCorps, NCCC, and VISTA. Awards of $4,725 per student are used to defray college costs or loans. Approximately 50,000 students received funds from this trust in 1999. In addition, $5 million of the Trust goes each year to the National Service Scholarship Program to reward outstanding service—by juniors and seniors in high schools. The FY 2000 appropriation to the National Service Trust is $69 million.

Past Issues

Volume IX (1993)

No. 1 *Escaping poverty: The promise of higher education.* Erika Kates

No. 2 *The U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child: Its relevance for social scientists.* Susan P. Limber & Målfrid Grude Flekkøy

No. 3 *Children who witness violence: The invisible victims.* Joy D. Osofsky

Volume X (1996)

No. 1 *Latin American immigration and U.S. Schools.* Claude Goldenberg

Nos. 2 & 3 *Is the emperor wearing clothes? Social policy and the empirical support for full inclusion of children with disabilities in the preschool and early elementary grades.* Bryna Siegel

Inclusion at the preschool level: An ecological systems analysis. Samuel L. Odom, Charles A. Peck, Marci Hanson, Paula J. Beckman, Ann P. Kaiser, Joan Lieber, William H. Brown, Eva M. Horn, & Ilene S. Schwartz

No. 4 *Building research and policy connections: Training and career options for developmental scientists.* Amy R. Susman-Stillman, Joshua L. Brown, Emma K. Adam, Clancy Blair, Robin Gaines, Rachel A. Gordon, Ann Marie White, & Sheri R. Wynn

No. 5 *A reconceptualization of the effects of undernutrition on children's biological, psychosocial, and behavioral development.* Ernesto Pollitt, Mari Golub, Kathleen Gorman, Sally Grantham-McGregor, David Levitsky, Beat Schürch, Barbara Strupp, & Theodore Wachs

Volume XI (1997)

No. 1 *Schooling, the hidden curriculum, and children's conceptions of poverty.* Judith A. Chafel

No. 2 *Training the applied developmental scientist for prevention and practice: Two current examples.* Celia Fisher & Joy Osofsky

No. 3 *Public policy schools as opportunities for developmental scientists: An overview and illustration.* Rachel A. Gordon & P. Lindsay Chase-Lansdale

Volume XII (1998)

No. 1 *Fathers' involvement with children: Perspectives from developing countries.* Patrice L. Engle & Cynthia Breaux

No. 2 *Investigating child care subsidy: What are we buying?* Helen Raikes

No. 3 *Implications of the 1996 welfare legislation for children: A research perspective.* Martha Zaslow, Kathryn Tout, Sheila Smith, & Kristin Moore

No. 4 *Improving the life chances of children in poverty: Assumptions and what we have learned.* Robert G. St.Pierre & Jean I. Layzer

Volume XIII (1999)

No. 1 *Beyond "giving science away": How university-community partnerships inform youth programs, research, and policy.* Jill Denner, Catherine R. Cooper, Edward M. Lopez, & Nora Dunbar

No. 2 *Perspectives on father involvement: Research and policy.* Catherine S. Tamis-LeMonda & Natasha Cabrera

No. 3 *Evaluating the effectiveness of school-based violence prevention: Developmental approaches.* Christopher C. Henrich, Joshua L. Brown, & J. Lawrence Aber

PURPOSE
of Social Policy Report

Social Policy Report (ISSN 1075-7031) is published four times a year by the Society for Research in Child Development. Its purpose is twofold: (1) to provide policymakers with objective reviews of research findings on topics of current national interest, and (2) to inform the SRCD membership about current policy issues relating to children and about the state of relevant research.

Content

The *Report* provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for policies affecting children. The Society recognizes that few policy issues are noncontroversial, that authors may well have a "point of view," but the *Report* is not intended to be a vehicle for authors to advocate particular positions on issues. Presentations should be balanced, accurate, and inclusive. The pubication nonetheless includes the disclaimer that the views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Society or the editor.

Procedures for Submission and Manuscript Preparation

Articles originate from a variety of sources. Some are solicited, but authors interested in submitting a manuscript are urged to propose timely topics to the editor. Manuscripts vary in length ranging from 20 to 30 pages of double-spaced text (approximately 8,000 to 14,000 words) plus references. Authors are asked to submit manuscripts electronically, if possible, but hard copy may be submitted with disk. Manuscripts should include text, references, and a brief biographical statement limited to the author's current position and special activities related to the topic. (See page 23, this issue, for the editor's addresses.)

Three or four reviews are obtained from academic or policy specialists with relevant expertise and different perspectives. Authors then make revisions based on these reviews and the editor's queries, working closely with the editor to arrive at the final form for publication.

The Committee on Child Development, Public Policy, and Public Information, which founded the *Report*, serves as an advisory body to all activities related to its publication.

NEW *SOCIAL POLICY REPORT* EDITOR APPOINTED FOR 2000

The Society for Research in Child Development is pleased to announce the appointment of the new editor of *Social Policy Report*, Lonnie Sherrod, and associate editor, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn.

Lonnie R. Sherrod is executive vice president of the William T. Grant Foundation, which funds research on child and youth development. He has been chair and co-chair of SRCD's Committee on Child Development, Public Policy, and Public Information and is currently on its dissemination subcommittee. He is on APA's Division 7 Executive Council and is the Division 7 liaison to the Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. He is on the Program Committee of the ACYF-sponsored biennial conference on research on Head Start.

Jeanne Brooks-Gunn is the Virginia and Leonard Marx Professor of Child Development and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. She is the first director of the Center for Children and Families, a research-policy-practice center, founded in 1992 at Teachers College. She also co-directs the Institute for Child and Family Policy at Columbia University, founded in 1999. Her research focuses on family and community influences on children, youth, and young adults and on interventions and policies that may affect development, especially that of vulnerable children. The author of many books and articles, she is currently editing a book series on research on youth policy for Harvard University Press.

Manuscripts for *SPR*, including hard copy and a disk, may be submitted by mail to

Lonnie Sherrod
William T. Grant Foundation
570 Lexington Avenue, 18th floor
New York, NY 10022

or by email to lsherrod@wtgrantfdn.org.

Inquiries about possible submissions can be directed by email to either Sherrod (above) or Brooks-Gunn at jb224@columbia.org.

Social Policy Report is *a quarterly publication of the Society for Research in Child Development. The* Report *provides a forum for scholarly reviews and discussions of developmental research and its implications for the policies affecting children. Copyright of the articles published in the* Report *is maintained by SRCD. Statements appearing in the* Report *are the views of the author and do not imply endorsement by the Editor or by SRCD.*

EDITOR: Lonnie Sherrod
PHONE: (212) 752-0071 - FAX: (212) 752-1398
E-MAIL: lsherrod@wtgrantfdn.org

Subscriptions available at $15.00 to nonmembers of SRCD, single issues at $4.80, and multiple copies at reduced rates. Write or phone:

SRCD Executive Office - University of Michigan - 505 East Huron, Suite 301 - Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522
(734) 998-6578

SRCD Executive Office
University of Michigan
505 East Huron, Suite 301
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1522

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 587
Ann Arbor,MI